

Frank B. Husted, Liberty.
Henry Suhre, Oldenburg.

KANSAS

Minnie Temple, Bennington.
Charles B. Doolittle, Centerville.

LOUISIANA

Anna S. Miller, Destrehan.

MAINE

Ethel M. McAllister, Andover.
Cynthia R. Clement, Seal Harbor.
Carroll M. Richardson, Westbrook.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edward L. Diamond, Easthampton.
Minot F. Inman, Foxboro.
Richard C. Taft, Oxford.

MICHIGAN

Gordon L. Anderson, Armada.
Lewis E. Kephart, Berrien Springs.
Albert W. Lee, Britton.
Bert E. Van Auker, Morley.

MISSISSIPPI

Preston C. Lewis, Aberdeen.
Leonard C. Gibson, Crawford.
Herbert B. Miller, Gloster.
Emmett L. Vanlandingham, McCool.
Blanche Gallaspy, Pelahatchee.
Charles A. Barnette, Silver Creek.

NEBRASKA

Oscar L. Lindgren, Bladen.
Carl J. Rasmussen, Elwood.
Mary E. Krisl, Milligan.
Floyd Buchanan, Silver Creek.

NEVADA

Coverton K. Ryerse, Las Vegas.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles D. Grant, Wolfeboro.

NEW JERSEY

Harry M. Riddle, Asbury.
Henry T. Ackerman, Keansburg.
Walter T. Stewart, Mount Holly.
Joseph G. Endres, Seaside Heights.
Mary MacG. Smith, Westwood.

NEW YORK

Eugene Velsor, Amityville.
George W. Steele, Brockport.
Howard A. McMurray, Deposit.
Fred S. Tripp, Guilford.
Everett S. Turner, Haverstraw.
Jul Johnson, Kinderhook.
Sadie E. Childs, Lewiston.
Walter E. Steves, New Rochelle.
J. Frank Engelbert, Nichols.
Eugene H. Ireland, Palatine Bridge.
Lottie Allen, Perryburg.
John W. Hedges, Pine Plains.
Frank P. Harrison, Roslyn.

NORTH CAROLINA

John W. Gilliam, Sanford.

NORTH DAKOTA

Gustav E. Gunderson, Antler.
Kathryn Savage, Braddock.
Fredrich A. Rettke, Niagara.
Cornelius Roverdink, Strasburg.
Joseph J. Simon, Thompson.

OHIO

James E. Davis, Belmont.
Roy G. Sutherin, East Palestine.
Joseph E. Walker, Greenfield.
Francis M. Birdsall, Hicksville.
John W. Switzer, Ohio City.
Emily C. Crowe, Windham.

OKLAHOMA

Oliver T. Robinson, Britton.
Ida White, Konawa.

OREGON

Elizabeth E. Johnson, Gresham.
John N. Williamson, Prineville.

PENNSYLVANIA

Otho H. Tavenner, Berwyn.
Ada S. Hollinger, Hanover.
John K. Ellis, Jeddo.
DeWitt C. Vail, New Milford.

PORTO RICO

America R. de Graciani, Ensenada.
Rafael del Valle, San Juan.

TENNESSEE

William R. Robinson, Charlotte.
Emmett V. Foster, Culleoka.
Columbus L. Parrish, Henderson.
William S. Tune, Shelbyville.

TEXAS

James T. Gray, Camp Wood.
Zettie Kelley, Diboll.
Arthur R. Franke, Goliad.
Roy B. Nichols, Houston.
Minnie S. Parish, Huntsville.
Milton S. Fenner, Karnes City.
Richard T. Polk, Killeen.
Alice Crow, Kountze.
Homer Howard, Lockney.
Myrtle L. Hurley, Robert Lee.
Frank B. Hall, San Saba.
Fred W. Hines, Wiergate.

VIRGINIA

Annie G. Davey, Evington.
William W. Middleton, Mount Jackson.
Mollie H. Gettle, Rustburg.
Ernest H. Croshaw, Stony Creek.
Frank L. Schofield, University of Richmond.

WASHINGTON

Tyrah D. Logsdon, Endicott.
Jay Faris, Grandview.
Walter J. Hunziker, Langley.

WEST VIRGINIA

Lydia P. Miller, Dorothy.
Clarence E. Brazeal, Maybeury.
William C. Bishop, Scarbro.
Delta D. Buck, Sistersville.
Florence Bills, Williamstown.
Mamie H. Barr, Winfield.

WYOMING

Forest H. Gurney, Buffalo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, May 29, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Francis J. Hurney, pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy Holy Spirit of counsel and fortitude these men here gathered for the welfare of the Nation.

Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct their deliberations and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty.

We recommend likewise to Thy unbounded mercy all our brethren and fellow citizens throughout these United States, that they may be blessed in the knowledge and sanctified in the observance of Thy most holy law, that they may be preserved in union and in that peace which the world can not give, and after enjoying the blessings of this life be admitted to those which are eternal. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4577. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between Longview, Wash., and Rainier, Oreg.;

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution prohibiting location or erection of any wharf or dock or artificial fill or bulkhead or other structure on the shores or in the waters of the Potomac River within the District of Columbia without the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital; and

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to print and bind the proceedings in Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in Statuary Hall, of the statue of Gen. John Campbell Greenway, presented by the State of Arizona.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9439. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Kanawha River between Henderson and Point Pleasant, W. Va.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 49) entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of the Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McNARY, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12236. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 9806. An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States; and

H. R. 12013. An act to revise and equalize the rate of pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, to certain widows, former widows of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, and granting pensions and increase of pensions in certain cases.

CONFERENCE REPORT—CIVIL WAR PENSIONS

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing a conference report on the bill (H. R. 12013) to revise and equalize the rate of pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, to certain widows, former widows of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, and granting pensions and increase of pensions in certain cases.

ADDRESS OF HON. ANTHONY J. GRIFFIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech he made in New York last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address he delivered in New York last Sunday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit the address made by me to the veterans of three wars at the World War Monument, Graham Square, Bronx, New York City, on Sunday, May 25, 1930:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1930—BEST GUARANTY OF WORLD PEACE IS JUSTICE TO SUBJECT RACES

Mr. Chairman, comrades, and friends, faithful to the obligations of a brotherhood as close and as firm as in any human relationship, the comrades of three wars have been accustomed, on this anniversary, to pay a solemn tribute to the memory of those loyal soldiers of our Republic who have answered the final summons and passed on to their eternal abode.

In each recurring year, we have watched with tender solicitude the thinning ranks of those brave men who fought under President Lincoln to maintain the integrity of our Federal Union.

One by one, they are dropping out of ranks, but not to fall behind—not to loiter, not to retreat. No! those were words not within their lexicon. They have answered the call of the Great Commander in Chief of all. They have only gone forward as the advance guard to clear the way and open wide the path on which we are to follow.

LXXII—619

Let us keep alive their memory and never fail each year to recall their noble example and their patriotic sacrifice.

Thirty-two years have passed into history since this Nation took up the cause of Cuba. That is only a brief span in the course of human events, but a long, long time in the life of man.

With thinning ranks also our comrades of the Spanish-American War come each year to pay our tribute of respect to departed comrades and renew the pledges of our devotion to our country.

We, too, have our advance guard in the spirit realms, who are clearing the way and making wide the path for us to follow.

To the veterans of the World War I need only to say that you are living up to the noblest traditions of our great country. You fought the great fight and bore the rigors of war with a fortitude unsurpassed in our history. Our country is not only grateful in words but has expressed its gratitude in deeds. In no other war in our life as a nation were the services and sacrifices of our soldiers so promptly recognized and rewarded. The soldiers of the American Revolution were not pensioned—and then only in a most niggardly fashion—until many years after. The soldiers of the Civil War had to wait nearly 20 years before a reluctant Congress granted them appropriate recognition.

The veterans of the Spanish-American War received no substantial recognition until our cause was joined to yours. It is candid truth to say that the veterans of the Spanish-American War would never have received their just deserts were it not for the fact that 4,000,000 veterans of the World War linked their cause with ours and impressed the country not only with the value of the soldier in the life of the Nation but with his importance as a political factor.

You fought a war of freedom—as much so as in any war in our history. You fought for high ideals—to keep the world safe for democracy. The conflict in which you engaged released the shackles that had bound many smaller nations in an intolerable bondage. If the World War had no other effect, it emphasized the great truth that only "right makes might" and that no nation shall hold in thralldom any other people against their will.

Occasions such as this are valueless if we fail to think, not only of our own future, but of that of our country. Having in mind that our intervention in Cuba was a purely idealistic act, that we kept the faith and enabled the island republic to take its place among the sovereign nations of the world, we ought not to forget that we owe a similar obligation to the Philippines.

I do not wish to raise a controversial issue upon an occasion such as this, but I believe that the honor and all of the sacred traditions of this country are at stake. It has never been the policy of this Nation to acquire colonies or maintain a sovereignty over other races which it is conceded can never become self-governing units in our Federal Union.

This Nation must be kept homogeneous, but, above and beyond all, we must keep our word and observe our pledges. We have pledged ourselves to recognize the sovereignty of the Philippines as soon as they were ready for self-government. I think that time is at hand. We should not risk our national reputation by keeping unwilling people in subjection for mere commercial aggrandizement. It is not in harmony with our traditions as a nation and can not help but be an endless source of anxiety and trouble.

It is a matter of supreme importance to the veterans of the Spanish-American War that our Nation shall keep the faith.

The long-continued custody of the Philippines means keeping alive danger points of contact with other nations. Within recent months this thought has come to me with striking force: If we mind our own business we will have no need of peace pacts or naval disarmament agreements! We can show the world in no better way our sincerity in the cause of justice and world peace than by releasing from our domination distant colonies and by allowing them to control their own destinies. The best guaranty of world peace is justice to subject races.

Gatherings such as these may be solemn, but they are not sad. We take a pride in our heroes. We cherish their long friendship, we regret their passing, but we know they have only gone forward to join the advance guard that clears the way and makes the path straight for us to follow.

With this thought in mind, let us renew our faith in the sacred traditions of our country and pledge ourselves to the task of upholding, so long as we shall be spared, its lofty ideals of justice and liberty.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight to file minority views on H. R. 9937, a bill to provide for summary prosecution of slight or casual violations of the national prohibition act.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to have until midnight to file minority views on House bill 9937. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A BIT OF PROPAGANDA EXPOSED

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on Senate bill 2498 and

to include therein an interview I gave out on May 24 regarding the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on Senate bill 2498, and to include an interview given out by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, reprints from a magazine article have just been distributed to the Members of the House in connection with S. 2498 and its companion bill, H. R. 6981. While this is just propaganda, I do not intend to ignore it. If the Members of the House will refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 19, 1930, you will find that I discussed the proposed legislation fully. I stated that it affected only my district, though introduced by a Member from another district, and I demonstrated that the proponents of the legislation were unfair and misleading.

When I noted this new development of circularizing the Members I again realized that Ernest Oberholtzer, the Minneapolis lobbyist, was busy, for the article in question bears his earmarks and is written in his usual clever and misleading fashion. Like Cleopatra, he possesses a great power to charm.

He appears in the rôle of the defender of the public, the beauty of whose lakelands is about to be ruined at once. He would have you believe that rejection of his program would result in permitting exploitation for private gain. His motives alone are pure and undefiled. So he would have it necessarily follow that all others are false and dangerous. This is all pleasing to the ear, but entirely misleading. The propaganda overlooks (in fact, it has to ignore) the bill which I introduced, H. R. 8968, which will accomplish the same purposes of the Minneapolis legislation. The reasons for its introduction are in no way obscure. Any claims to the contrary are false. The bill was introduced at the request of the people of the district affected. Mr. Oberholtzer would ignore entirely their rights to be heard in the matter.

On May 24, 1930, I issued a statement which correctly gives the present status of the legislative program. This statement appeared in the Duluth Herald for that date, and is as follows:

Prospects for the passage of the Shipstead-Nolan bill at this session of Congress appear very doubtful, due to the failure of the proponents of the measure to agree to cut down the area to correspond to the Pittenger bill.

It was learned yesterday that Congressman PITTINGER made a definite offer to compromise the dispute with Congressman NOLAN and withdraw his parliamentary objections to the bill, provided that the Shipstead-Nolan bill would be amended to conform to the restricted area in the Pittenger bill. Congressman PITTINGER further offered to consent to an amendment that would bring all Government-owned lands within the Superior National Forest and outside the restricted area of the Pittenger bill under the provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan bill.

Following the conference Mr. PITTINGER stated that Congressman NOLAN advised him definitely that he was without authority to agree to any compromise or amendments without the sanction of the proponents of the Shipstead-Nolan measure, and that he did not have their consent. Mr. PITTINGER endeavored to have Ernest Oberholtzer, who has been active in working for the bill during the session, called into conference in an effort to come to an agreement. It was claimed that Oberholtzer left town a few days ago and has not returned to Washington.

The parliamentary battle over this legislation has been carried on vigorously ever since the Shipstead bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent some time ago. Efforts were made in the House to have the Rules Committee grant a rule to give the bill the right of way in the House, and to ignore the Pittenger amendment. This plan was attacked by the eighth district Congressman, and apparently with good results, for the Rules Committee has never granted the rule. The proponents of the Shipstead-Nolan measure then endeavored to have Speaker LONGWORTH give the bill a privileged status, and for the past 10 days Congressman PITTINGER has charged that "powerful influences" have been at work along these lines. It developed yesterday that Speaker LONGWORTH had suggested to the Congressmen interested that they come to some compromise agreement, and stated unofficially that the Senate and House bills, not being identical, could not be given a privileged status.

In discussing the matter Congressman PITTINGER said: "I have offered to compromise the dispute with Congressman NOLAN, at the request of the people of the eighth district interested in this matter. My proposal was an amendment to the Shipstead-Nolan bill for the restricted area I have advocated, and further providing that the shore lines of all lakes within the Superior National Forest should come within the terms of the bill. Mr. NOLAN claimed to be without authority to act, and I advised him that I would be glad to confer with

the proponents of his measure. I have been informed that parties in my district are agreeable to this compromise arrangement, and the responsibility for the failure of this compromise plan rests somewhere, either in Washington or Minneapolis, with the proponents of the measure, who have seen fit to refuse to come forward and confer on the proposition. They have failed entirely to confer with me on this matter, or to grant Congressman NOLAN authority to do so. Their methods are responsible for the delay."

IMMIGRATION AND EMIGRATION

Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by having printed therein a letter to me from the United States Department of Labor, and also certain statistics regarding immigration and emigration to and from the United States during the last five years.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by having printed therein a letter to me from the United States Department of Labor, and also certain statistics regarding immigration and emigration to and from the United States during the last five years.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION,
Washington, March 11, 1930.

HON. FRANK M. RAMEY,

Member of Congress, House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAMEY: In compliance with your recent request, I take pleasure in transmitting herewith two tables, one covering the number of immigrant aliens admitted to the United States during each of the last five fiscal years, 1925 to 1929, by countries of last permanent residence, and the other covering United States citizens departed during the same years by countries of intended future permanent residence. There is also inclosed a table showing how the immigrants admitted during said years were recorded by race or people.

Very truly yours,

HARRY E. HULL,
Commissioner General.

Immigrant aliens admitted to the United States during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1925 to 1929, by years, and by race or people

| Race or people | Fiscal year ended June 30— | | | | | Total |
|---|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| | 1925 | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | |
| All races..... | 294,314 | 304,488 | 335,175 | 307,255 | 279,678 | 1,520,910 |
| African (black)..... | 791 | 894 | 955 | 956 | 1,254 | 4,850 |
| Armenian..... | 576 | 741 | 983 | 1,062 | 929 | 4,291 |
| Bohemian and Moravian..... | 1,833 | 2,494 | 2,406 | 1,248 | 1,427 | 9,408 |
| Bulgarian, Serbian, and Montenegrin..... | 418 | 532 | 600 | 531 | 685 | 2,766 |
| Chinese..... | 1,721 | 1,375 | 1,051 | 931 | 1,071 | 6,149 |
| Croatian and Slovenian..... | 520 | 692 | 821 | 938 | 1,075 | 4,046 |
| Cuban..... | 912 | 1,476 | 1,919 | 2,058 | 2,141 | 8,506 |
| Dalmatian, Bosnian, and Herzegovinian..... | 51 | 75 | 69 | 95 | 119 | 409 |
| Dutch and Flemish..... | 3,189 | 3,156 | 3,125 | 2,880 | 2,949 | 15,299 |
| East Indian..... | 45 | 50 | 51 | 38 | 55 | 240 |
| English..... | 50,580 | 44,208 | 40,165 | 33,597 | 29,846 | 198,394 |
| Finnish..... | 689 | 674 | 629 | 544 | 509 | 3,045 |
| French..... | 23,240 | 22,237 | 19,313 | 17,963 | 16,957 | 99,710 |
| German..... | 54,215 | 58,675 | 56,587 | 54,157 | 55,631 | 279,265 |
| Greek..... | 1,068 | 1,385 | 2,557 | 2,818 | 3,025 | 10,883 |
| Hebrew..... | 10,292 | 10,267 | 11,483 | 11,639 | 12,479 | 56,160 |
| Irish..... | 42,661 | 42,475 | 44,726 | 38,193 | 30,922 | 198,977 |
| Italian (north)..... | 1,784 | 1,486 | 2,637 | 2,653 | 2,631 | 11,191 |
| Italian (south)..... | 5,512 | 7,888 | 15,892 | 16,087 | 16,452 | 61,831 |
| Japanese..... | 682 | 598 | 680 | 522 | 716 | 3,178 |
| Korean..... | 26 | 52 | 47 | 22 | 49 | 196 |
| Lithuanian..... | 329 | 393 | 549 | 326 | 409 | 2,006 |
| Magyar..... | 885 | 1,076 | 1,049 | 1,112 | 1,342 | 5,464 |
| Mexican..... | 32,378 | 42,638 | 66,766 | 57,765 | 38,980 | 238,527 |
| Pacific Islander..... | 3 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 19 |
| Polish..... | 3,178 | 3,175 | 4,249 | 4,238 | 3,507 | 18,347 |
| Portuguese..... | 720 | 793 | 843 | 844 | 853 | 4,053 |
| Rumanian..... | 391 | 319 | 422 | 443 | 585 | 2,160 |
| Russian..... | 1,225 | 938 | 1,249 | 1,249 | 1,352 | 6,013 |
| Ruthenian (Russniak)..... | 667 | 505 | 445 | 411 | 532 | 2,560 |
| Scandinavian (Norwegians, Danes, and Swedes)..... | 20,146 | 19,418 | 19,235 | 18,664 | 19,428 | 96,891 |
| Scotch..... | 27,503 | 27,298 | 25,544 | 23,177 | 21,926 | 125,448 |
| Slovak..... | 620 | 534 | 1,017 | 2,197 | 2,443 | 6,811 |
| Spanish..... | 588 | 699 | 1,065 | 1,018 | 899 | 4,269 |
| Spanish-American..... | 2,349 | 2,519 | 3,185 | 3,490 | 3,259 | 14,802 |
| Syrian..... | 450 | 488 | 684 | 613 | 632 | 2,867 |
| Turkish..... | 87 | 197 | 112 | 143 | 127 | 666 |
| Welsh..... | 1,167 | 1,314 | 1,300 | 1,723 | 1,659 | 7,163 |
| West Indian (except Cuban)..... | 325 | 373 | 381 | 394 | 380 | 1,853 |
| Other peoples..... | 498 | 381 | 396 | 484 | 438 | 2,197 |

Immigrant aliens admitted to the United States during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1925 to 1929, by years, and by countries of last permanent residence

| Countries of last permanent residence | Fiscal year ended June 30— | | | | | Total |
|--|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| | 1925 | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | |
| All countries..... | 294,314 | 04,488 | 335,175 | 307,255 | 279,678 | 1,520,910 |
| Europe, total..... | 148,306 | 155,562 | 168,368 | 158,513 | 158,598 | 789,407 |
| Albania..... | 79 | 158 | 243 | 263 | 329 | 1,072 |
| Austria..... | 899 | 1,102 | 1,016 | 1,277 | 1,256 | 5,550 |
| Belgium..... | 726 | 718 | 764 | 698 | 669 | 3,575 |
| Bulgaria..... | 140 | 175 | 222 | 158 | 215 | 910 |
| Czechoslovakia..... | 2,462 | 2,953 | 3,540 | 3,571 | 4,411 | 16,937 |
| Danzig, Free City of..... | 243 | 210 | 223 | 224 | 204 | 1,104 |
| Denmark..... | 2,444 | 2,549 | 2,505 | 2,473 | 2,525 | 12,496 |
| Estonia..... | 131 | 132 | 139 | 131 | 141 | 679 |
| Finland..... | 480 | 491 | 438 | 473 | 416 | 2,298 |
| France, including Corsica..... | 3,906 | 4,181 | 4,405 | 4,438 | 4,428 | 21,358 |
| Germany..... | 46,068 | 50,421 | 48,513 | 45,778 | 46,751 | 237,531 |
| Great Britain: | | | | | | |
| England..... | 13,897 | 10,599 | 9,990 | 7,338 | 8,008 | 49,832 |
| Scotland..... | 12,378 | 13,661 | 12,611 | 11,085 | 11,892 | 61,627 |
| Wales..... | 897 | 1,268 | 1,068 | 1,535 | 1,427 | 6,195 |
| Greece..... | 826 | 1,121 | 2,089 | 2,328 | 2,266 | 8,630 |
| Hungary..... | 616 | 906 | 813 | 857 | 1,045 | 4,237 |
| Northern Ireland..... | 1,210 | 419 | 491 | 724 | 2,249 | 5,093 |
| Irish Free State..... | 25,440 | 24,478 | 28,054 | 24,544 | 17,672 | 120,188 |
| Italy, including Sicily and Sardinia..... | 6,203 | 8,253 | 17,297 | 17,728 | 18,008 | 67,489 |
| Latvia..... | 263 | 298 | 403 | 258 | 334 | 1,556 |
| Lithuania..... | 472 | 636 | 770 | 531 | 625 | 3,034 |
| Luxembourg..... | 150 | 127 | 111 | 106 | 112 | 606 |
| Netherlands..... | 1,723 | 1,753 | 1,733 | 1,843 | 1,742 | 8,794 |
| Norway..... | 5,975 | 5,756 | 6,098 | 5,660 | 5,977 | 29,436 |
| Poland..... | 5,341 | 7,126 | 9,211 | 8,755 | 9,002 | 39,435 |
| Portugal, including Azores, Cape Verde, and Madeira Islands..... | 619 | 666 | 567 | 584 | 623 | 3,059 |
| Rumania..... | 1,163 | 1,211 | 1,270 | 1,376 | 1,707 | 6,727 |
| Russia..... | 1,775 | 1,766 | 1,183 | 1,254 | 934 | 6,912 |
| Spain, including Canary and Balearic Islands..... | 275 | 326 | 429 | 455 | 547 | 2,032 |
| Sweden..... | 8,391 | 8,513 | 8,287 | 8,051 | 8,877 | 42,119 |
| Switzerland..... | 2,043 | 1,994 | 2,121 | 1,994 | 2,140 | 10,292 |
| Turkey in Europe..... | 263 | 210 | 216 | 242 | 231 | 1,162 |
| Yugoslavia..... | 724 | 1,059 | 1,190 | 1,386 | 1,369 | 5,728 |
| Other Europe..... | 144 | 326 | 388 | 390 | 406 | 1,714 |
| Asia, total..... | 3,578 | 3,413 | 3,609 | 3,380 | 3,758 | 17,798 |
| Armenia..... | 13 | 16 | 13 | 21 | 13 | 76 |
| China..... | 1,937 | 1,751 | 1,471 | 1,320 | 1,446 | 7,925 |
| India..... | 65 | 93 | 102 | 102 | 103 | 465 |
| Japan..... | 723 | 654 | 723 | 550 | 771 | 3,421 |
| Palestine..... | 301 | 250 | 464 | 554 | 600 | 2,169 |
| Persia..... | 32 | 56 | 33 | 50 | 37 | 208 |
| Syria..... | 369 | 429 | 590 | 504 | 469 | 2,361 |
| Turkey in Asia..... | 38 | 21 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 235 |
| Other Asia..... | 100 | 143 | 213 | 220 | 262 | 938 |
| America, total..... | 141,496 | 144,393 | 161,872 | 144,281 | 116,177 | 708,219 |
| Canada..... | 100,895 | 91,019 | 81,506 | 73,154 | 64,440 | 411,014 |
| Newfoundland..... | 1,858 | 2,349 | 3,074 | 2,127 | 2,011 | 11,419 |
| Mexico..... | 32,964 | 43,316 | 67,721 | 59,016 | 40,154 | 243,171 |
| Cuba..... | 1,430 | 2,281 | 3,020 | 3,012 | 3,026 | 12,769 |
| Other West Indies..... | 676 | 941 | 999 | 1,046 | 1,280 | 4,942 |
| British Honduras..... | 42 | 39 | 108 | 31 | 65 | 285 |
| Other Central America..... | 1,157 | 1,335 | 1,663 | 1,720 | 1,492 | 7,367 |
| Brazil..... | 534 | 877 | 1,089 | 1,213 | 914 | 4,627 |
| Other South America..... | 1,936 | 2,230 | 2,688 | 2,953 | 2,789 | 12,596 |
| Other America..... | 4 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 29 |
| Others, total..... | 874 | 1,120 | 1,266 | 1,081 | 1,145 | 5,486 |
| Egypt..... | 142 | 214 | 228 | 215 | 264 | 1,063 |
| Other America..... | 270 | 315 | 292 | 260 | 245 | 1,382 |
| Australia and appertaining islands..... | 273 | 376 | 464 | 385 | 448 | 1,946 |
| New Zealand and appertaining islands..... | 143 | 180 | 248 | 193 | 171 | 935 |
| Other Pacific islands..... | 46 | 35 | 34 | 28 | 17 | 160 |

Citizens departed from the United States during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1925 to 1929, by years and by countries of intended future permanent residence

| Countries of intended future permanent residence | Fiscal year ended June 30— | | | | | Total |
|--|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| | 1925 | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | |
| All countries..... | 25,429 | 28,182 | 22,786 | 21,432 | 23,443 | 121,272 |
| Europe, total..... | 9,285 | 9,678 | 5,658 | 3,376 | 2,188 | 30,185 |
| Albania..... | 3 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 27 |
| Austria..... | 53 | 122 | 76 | 67 | 12 | 330 |
| Belgium..... | 92 | 181 | 82 | 52 | 59 | 466 |
| Bulgaria..... | 9 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 26 |
| Czechoslovakia..... | 777 | 689 | 311 | 200 | 89 | 2,066 |
| Danzig, Free City of..... | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Denmark..... | 50 | 63 | 50 | 10 | 10 | 183 |
| Estonia..... | 1 | 2 | | | | 3 |
| Finland..... | 35 | 28 | 24 | 19 | 15 | 121 |

Citizens departed from the United States during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1925 to 1929, by years and by countries of intended future permanent residence—Continued

| Countries of intended future permanent residence | Fiscal year ended June 30— | | | | | Total |
|--|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1925 | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | |
| France, including Corsica..... | 502 | 544 | 438 | 150 | 332 | 1,966 |
| Germany..... | 455 | 527 | 310 | 207 | 167 | 1,666 |
| Great Britain: | | | | | | |
| England..... | 852 | 784 | 455 | 254 | 476 | 2,821 |
| Scotland..... | 169 | 165 | 158 | 96 | 74 | 662 |
| Wales..... | 6 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 24 |
| Greece..... | 508 | 502 | 328 | 148 | 26 | 1,512 |
| Hungary..... | 206 | 235 | 131 | 133 | 61 | 766 |
| Northern Ireland..... | 60 | 43 | 31 | 3 | 2 | 139 |
| Irish Free State..... | 155 | 111 | 142 | 89 | 66 | 563 |
| Italy, including Sicily and Sardinia..... | 2,964 | 3,104 | 1,688 | 1,025 | 350 | 9,131 |
| Latvia..... | 11 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 32 |
| Lithuania..... | 177 | 151 | 74 | 64 | 43 | 509 |
| Luxembourg..... | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | | 15 |
| Netherlands..... | 72 | 60 | 55 | 31 | 27 | 245 |
| Norway..... | 138 | 193 | 81 | 42 | 6 | 460 |
| Poland..... | 947 | 843 | 441 | 383 | 127 | 2,741 |
| Portugal, including Azores, Cape Verde, and Madeira Islands..... | 75 | 103 | 80 | 32 | 11 | 301 |
| Rumania..... | 216 | 320 | 213 | 83 | 39 | 871 |
| Russia..... | 67 | 45 | 26 | 27 | 16 | 181 |
| Spain, including Canary and Balearic Islands..... | 160 | 118 | 64 | 44 | 41 | 427 |
| Sweden..... | 63 | 105 | 77 | 48 | 24 | 318 |
| Switzerland..... | 57 | 107 | 69 | 50 | 48 | 331 |
| Turkey in Europe..... | 5 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 30 |
| Yugoslavia..... | 383 | 469 | 233 | 89 | 55 | 1,229 |
| Other Europe..... | 11 | 4 | 1 | 6 | | 22 |
| Asia, total..... | 2,593 | 2,376 | 3,137 | 1,939 | 2,552 | 12,597 |
| Armenia..... | 4 | | | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| China..... | 1,671 | 1,629 | 2,332 | 1,381 | 1,879 | 8,892 |
| India..... | 197 | 151 | 187 | 45 | 134 | 714 |
| Japan..... | 471 | 381 | 444 | 390 | 370 | 2,056 |
| Palestine..... | 35 | 26 | 14 | 6 | 12 | 93 |
| Persia..... | 12 | 4 | 4 | 2 | | 22 |
| Syria..... | 58 | 21 | 35 | 22 | 5 | 141 |
| Turkey in Asia..... | 6 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 31 |
| Other Asia..... | 139 | 155 | 110 | 87 | 150 | 641 |
| America, total..... | 13,324 | 15,939 | 13,791 | 16,062 | 18,570 | 77,686 |
| Canada..... | 9,502 | 11,735 | 11,095 | 14,777 | 16,886 | 63,995 |
| Newfoundland..... | 34 | 23 | 29 | 20 | 3 | 109 |
| Mexico..... | 699 | 627 | 439 | 561 | 725 | 3,051 |
| Cuba..... | 628 | 561 | 300 | 129 | 215 | 1,833 |
| Other West Indies..... | 1,347 | 1,892 | 1,205 | 405 | 224 | 5,073 |
| British Honduras..... | 17 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 36 |
| Other Central America..... | 769 | 629 | 311 | 68 | 254 | 2,031 |
| Brazil..... | 38 | 55 | 41 | 10 | 61 | 205 |
| Other South America..... | 289 | 414 | 361 | 89 | 198 | 1,351 |
| Other America..... | 1 | | | | 1 | 2 |
| Others, total..... | 227 | 189 | 200 | 55 | 133 | 804 |
| Egypt..... | 42 | 24 | 23 | 1 | 26 | 116 |
| Other Africa..... | 85 | 56 | 72 | 16 | 47 | 276 |
| Australia and appertaining islands..... | 42 | 69 | 73 | 23 | 33 | 240 |
| New Zealand and appertaining islands..... | 28 | 8 | 6 | 4 | | 46 |
| Other Pacific islands..... | 30 | 32 | 26 | 11 | 27 | 126 |

REFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the rereference of a bill introduced by myself. This bill provides for an appropriation of \$300,000 for continuing and enlarging, if necessary, the immigration border patrol and providing for the increases in pay which are necessary under the law, such provision not having been made by an appropriation. This bill was referred to the Immigration Committee, whereas I am sure it should be referred to the Appropriations Committee.

The SPEAKER. What is the number of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I find I have the wrong RECORD and will supply the number later.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be rereferred.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand what this bill is. If I understood the gentleman from Washington correctly, it is a proposal to increase the pay of the immigration border patrol?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; if the gentleman will permit, that is not the purpose.

Mr. GARNER. Why does the Appropriations Committee have jurisdiction over the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will restate the situation as I understand it. No increase in appropriation has been made in the regular appropriation bill which carries Labor Department appropriations for funds necessary to make the increases of pay to members of the immigration border patrol as provided

by law, and no sum has been appropriated for the increase of the border patrol. Therefore, if that situation stands, the border patrol will have to be reduced in size in order to take care of the increases or advances in pay which are required by law. I introduced a bill yesterday, with the idea that it would go to the Appropriations Committee, and they can gather the testimony and satisfy themselves.

Mr. GARNER. For the moment I will object. I am not going to wait until the gentleman ascertains the number of a bill which he says should be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which committee has no legislative jurisdiction whatever. If the matter is already provided for by law the Appropriations Committee has all the necessary power to report an appropriation. If it has not been authorized by law, then the Appropriations Committee could not make the appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is required by law, and the bill which I introduced should not be referred to the Immigration Committee but to the Committee on Appropriations, and it is for the purpose of calling that committee's attention to the situation.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman is calling their attention to the situation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. If I understand the proposition correctly, the gentleman from Washington has introduced a bill which he wants referred to the Committee on Appropriations merely for the purpose of calling their attention to the situation. If that is the way in which the gentleman wants to communicate with the committee I will have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is a legal and a proper way.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me the gentleman should call the attention of the Appropriations Committee to this matter without introducing a bill and having it referred to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No doubt this brief debate will call it to their attention. However, I will introduce another bill, worded more directly, so that it will have to be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. That committee can then call the proper witnesses and ascertain the exact situation before it reports its supplemental bill. So, an objection might really help the situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

EXPOSITION AT PARIS, FRANCE, IN 1931

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) for the participation of the United States in an exposition to be held at Paris, France, in 1931.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. This joint resolution is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, there is no quorum present.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division on the motion for a call of the House.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 57, noes 37.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. (After counting). Three gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

So the yeas and nays were refused.

So a call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 52]

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Abernethy | Craddock | Graham | Ketcham |
| Arentz | Curry | Greenwood | Kless |
| Arnold | Dempsey | Hall, Miss. | Kunz |
| Aswell | Dickinson | Hare | Kurtz |
| Auf der Heide | Dickstein | Hooper | Langley |
| Bankhead | Douglass, Mass. | Houston | Larsen |
| Beck | Doutrich | Hudson | Leech |
| Beedy | Doyle | Hudspeth | Letts |
| Britten | Drane | Hull, William E. | Lindsay |
| Brumm | Englebright | Igoe | McClintick, Ohio |
| Brunner | Esterly | James | McCormack, Mass. |
| Burness | Evans, Calif. | Jeffers | McCormick, Ill. |
| Carley | Finley | Jenkins | Mead |
| Carter, Wyo. | Fitzpatrick | Johnson, Ill. | Michaelson |
| Celler | Fort | Johnson, Ind. | Mooney |
| Chase | Freeman | Johnson, Okla. | Morgan |
| Clarke, N. Y. | Fulmer | Johnson, S. Dak. | Mouser |
| Cochran, Pa. | Gambrill | Kearns | Murphy |
| Connery | Gasque | Kemp | Niedringhaus |
| Cooke | Gifford | Kennedy | Nolan |
| Cooper, Ohio | Golder | Kerr | Norton |

Oliver, N. Y.
Owen
Palmisano
Parks
Peavey
Porter
Prall
Pratt, Ruth
Quayle

Reid, Ill.
Robinson
Sabath
Seiberling
Short
Sirovich
Spearing
Sprout, Ill.
Stafford

Stedman
Stevenson
Strong, Kans.
Sullivan, N. Y.
Sullivan, Pa.
Taylor, Colo.
Taylor, Tenn.
Temple
Underhill

Underwood
Vincent, Mich.
Watson
White
Whitehead
Wolfenden
Wood
Yon

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seven Members present, a quorum.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 243, noes 0.

So further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. This joint resolution is on the Union Calendar and the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 311, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with.

Mr. LA GUARDIA and Mr. JOHNSON of Washington objected.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the invitation extended by the Government of France to the United States to participate in an international exposition of colonial and overseas countries to be held at Paris, France, in 1931, is hereby accepted.

Sec. 2. The President is authorized to appoint a commissioner general and two commissioners to represent the United States in the exposition, the amount of the compensation of each of whom not, however, to exceed \$10,000 per annum, shall be determined by the Secretary of State. The commissioner general shall prescribe the duties of the two commissioners and shall under the direction of the Secretary of State, (1) make all needful rules and regulations relative to the exhibits from this country and its overseas territories, and for the expenditures incident to the installation of such exhibits, and for the preparation of reports of the exposition and the general results thereof; (2) furnish such information to private exhibitors and prospective exhibitors as he may deem requisite and feasible; (3) make all proper arrangements for the preparation, transportation, installation, display, and care of the exhibits from this country and its overseas territories; (4) with reference to such exhibits from this country and its overseas territories, and reports, cooperate with and secure the assistance of the various executive departments and branches of the Government participating in the exposition, which departments and branches may, with the approval of the Secretary of State, designate officials or employees of their departments or branches to assist the commissioner general, but no such official or employee so designated shall receive a salary in excess of the amount which he has been receiving in the department or branch where employed, plus such reasonable additional allowance for expenses as may be deemed proper by the Secretary of State; (5) employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as may be necessary and fix their reasonable compensation; and (6) purchase such material, contract for such labor and services, and cause to be constructed such building as may be necessary to carry out the general purpose of this act. The heads of the various departments and branches of the Government are authorized, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, to collect and prepare suitable exhibits for display at the exposition, accompanied by appropriate descriptions in the French and English languages.

Sec. 3. Officers and employees of the executive departments or branches of the Government in charge of or responsible for the safe-keeping of any property of this country and its overseas territories, which is proposed to be exhibited, may permit such property on the request of the commissioner general, to pass from their possession for the purpose of being transported to and from and exhibited at the exposition. At the close of the exposition, if practicable, the commissioner general shall cause all such property to be returned to the respective departments and branches from which taken; and if the return of any such property is not practicable, he may, with the knowledge of the department or branch from which it was taken, and with the approval of the Secretary of State, make such disposition thereof as he may deem advisable and account therefor.

Sec. 4. In order to defray the expenses hereinbefore specified and all and singular expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of this act the sum of \$250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended. All expenditures shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of State and payable upon his certification, but shall not be subject to the provisions of any law other than this act regulating or limiting the expenditure of public money, but this provision shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office

for audit or permit any indebtedness to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 5. The commissioner general, with the approval of the Secretary of State, may receive from any source contributions to aid in carrying out the general purpose of this act, but the same shall be expended and accounted for in the same manner as any appropriation which may be made under authority of this act. The commissioner general is also authorized to receive contributions of material to aid in carrying out the general purpose of this act, and at the close of the exposition or when the connection of the Government of the United States herewith ceases, under the direction of the Secretary of State, shall dispose of any such portion thereof as may be unused, and any building which may have been constructed and account therefor.

SEC. 6. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to transmit to Congress within six months after the close of the exposition a detailed statement of all expenditures, together with the reports heretofore specified and such other reports as he may deem proper, which reports shall be prepared and arranged with a view to concise statement and convenient reference.

Mr. FISH and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the Chair whether I will be in charge of the time in favor of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the rule provides that there shall be two hours of general debate, divided equally between those for and against the joint resolution. A Member securing recognition is entitled to such recognition for one hour and during that time may yield to others. If, however, a Member who gets recognition does not consume the entire hour, the Chair would recognize some one else to consume the balance of the hour. A similar situation would exist with reference to those who are against the resolution.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall ask recognition in opposition to the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that if no member of the committee desires recognition in opposition to the bill or no one on the minority side, the Chair will bear the gentleman's notice in mind.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, this resolution (H. J. Res. 311) is in response to an invitation from the French Government to participate in an exposition in France in 1931.

At the outset may I say that the following nations have already signified their intention to participate: Italy, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Portugal.

The nations that are to be represented exclusively in the city of information are Great Britain and South and Central American States. Canada and Spain expect to build pavilions at the exposition.

When the invitation was received the Department of State and the Department of Commerce, after looking into the matter, forwarded letters recommending that the United States should participate in this exposition.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; at any time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The question of the invitation is bothering me somewhat. Has the gentleman got the invitation?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. I have here a copy of the letter, translated from the French, from the embassy of the French Republic to the United States, under date of April 6, 1927, addressed to the Secretary of State and signed by Ambassador Claudel, asking that the United States participate in this exposition.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman read the letter?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

EMBASSY OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC TO THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 6, 1927.

MR. SECRETARY OF STATE: The French Government, by authority of the Parliament, has decided to organize¹ in 1929 an International Colonial Exposition in Paris. The main characteristics of that event are given in the note, a copy of which I inclose to your excellency.

The higher council of the exposition thought there might be occasion to invite not only the powers with the colonies but also the countries producing articles like those of the French possessions beyond the seas. For that reason Mr. Briand instructed me to send to the American Government an official invitation to participate in this exposition as the Government of the Republic attaches the greatest value to the adhesion of the United States.

In order to have the time needed for the preparation of foreign participations, Mr. Briand would like to know at the earliest possible date

the answer your excellency may be pleased to return, which I am to report by telegraph. I shall shortly forward to your excellency copies of the general rules of the exposition and also the notice and general plan to be published on that occasion by the Minister of Colonies.

I may add that the American who would be designated to prepare the participation in that exposition might, for all additional information, directly communicate with Mr. Gabriel Angoulvant, Deputy, Governor General of Colonies, Commissioner General of the International Colonial Exposition, at the Ministry of Colonies in Paris.

Be pleased to accept, etc.

CLAUDEL.

His Excellency HON. FRANK B. KELLOGG,
Secretary of State of the United States.

Does that satisfy the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That does not contain one word of an invitation.

Mr. BLOOM. I am sorry, but this is a copy of the invitation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows that an invitation of this kind is transmitted to Congress by the President. With this is a letter from Mr. Edge, ambassador to Paris, and some comments by Mr. Cotton, but I challenge the gentleman, or any member of the committee, to show one sentence in the report that we have been officially invited.

Mr. BLOOM. We were officially invited. The Secretary of State, or the Acting Secretary of State, would not have sent any communication to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee unless he had authority to do it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Have you any communication from the Department of State?

Mr. BLOOM. I have a copy of it, I have not the original. This is from the Acting Secretary of State. Do you want me to read all of it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I want to get the contents of it. I am serious about this.

Mr. BLOOM. So am I. It is a long letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 15, 1930.

The Hon. STEPHEN G. PORTER,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: I wish to amplify my letter of April 9, 1930, advising you that I am in favor of House Joint Resolution 279 with reference to participation in the International Colonial Exposition to be held at Paris, France, in 1931.

There is reason to believe that our absence from the exhibition might make us conspicuous, particularly as attention would doubtless be drawn to our elaborate participation in the Seville Exposition—

I want to call your attention, and the attention of the committee, to the fact that there are reasons why we should participate in this exposition. The gentleman from New York wants all the reasons and I am going to give him those reasons in plain words—

Furthermore, we have just extended an invitation to France to be represented at the Century of Progress Exposition to be held in Chicago in 1933. Our failure to respond to the French invitation would be likely to prejudice the character of French participation in the Chicago Exposition.

Right here I want to say that we are extending an invitation to France to attend the celebration in 1932. In that we have reason to be proud of what France did for us at the time of the Revolution. If we invite France to participate in 1932 and 1933 in Chicago, and refuse to accept their invitation to participate in their exposition in 1931, I do not think that is reciprocity.

A dispatch has just been received from our American ambassador, Mr. Edge, at Paris, indicating his interest in the exposition and expressing the belief that our participation therein would have a tendency to facilitate the consideration of pending questions. The ambassador states that French Government officials are deeply interested in the success of the exposition.

Inclosed with the ambassador's dispatch is a letter dated March 18, 1930, a translation of which is inclosed, from Marshall Lyautey, who is commissioner general of the exposition. It will be noted from this letter that there are apparently two methods of participation in the exposition, one to erect a building and the other to participate in the "international city of information."

There is likewise inclosed a translation of a memorandum from the secretariat of the exposition showing those countries which have to date agreed to participate and the character of their participation.

There is also inclosed a letter dated April 7, 1930, from the Secretary of Commerce presenting the commercial aspects of the question of participation, and expressing his opinion that acceptance of the invitation and participation by the United States would be justifiable.

¹ In 1931 an International Colonial Exposition and Exposition of Overseas Countries.

As the exposition will unquestionably have important commercial characteristics, I believe that the Secretary of Commerce can also appropriately comment as to the character of possible American participation and the extent thereof.

Sincerely yours,

J. P. COTTON, *Acting Secretary.*

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. SEARS. I think many of us would like to know why it is that this has not been brought up long ago. This seems to be three years old.

Mr. BLOOM. As soon as the Committee on Foreign Affairs got it we tried to report it out as soon as possible. The reason why it was not brought up before is that the exposition was postponed.

Mr. SEARS. How long was it before the committee?

Mr. BLOOM. The bill was introduced April 21, 1930.

Mr. SEARS. And the invitation was sent three years ago?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; but the exposition was postponed. It was to be held in 1929, and it was postponed until 1931.

Mr. SEARS. Does the President recommend that we should participate?

Mr. BLOOM. We have nothing here from the President, but Ambassador Edge was requested to take up the matter. It may have been because of the illness of Ambassador Herrick.

Mr. SEARS. It seems to me that if we should send an invitation to participate in the Chicago exposition it would be more of a formality than we have here.

Mr. BLOOM. That is not the fault of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. As soon as we had it we held hearings and reported it out.

Mr. SEARS. I should think that we would offer a resolution and have it passed, if the administration were going to extend an invitation to these other nations, in a most formal manner.

Mr. BLOOM. We can not act upon it until the Committee on Foreign Affairs has information to act upon.

Mr. ALMON. Does not the gentleman think that the amount of \$250,000 authorized to be appropriated is rather more than should be called for during these hard times, when there are so many men unemployed and conditions are so unfavorable?

Mr. BLOOM. I will answer the gentleman in this way: The French Government participated officially in a number of international expositions held in the United States. It participated in 1876 at Philadelphia, in Chicago in 1893, in St. Louis in 1904, and in San Francisco in 1915. While France was engaged in the war in 1915 she participated in the exposition in San Francisco and at that time expended 2,000,000 francs, or \$400,000, and France needed her money very badly at that time. In all of the participations in our expositions in this country France has never refused at any time and she has never spent less than that sum, and if she participates in the Chicago exposition in 1933 she will have to spend more than \$250,000.

Mr. ALMON. Can the gentleman give the committee any assurance that Congress will not be asked for an additional amount after this affair is all over?

Mr. BLOOM. Absolutely; because the committee has placed in this resolution a provision that if they want any more money they are supposed to go out and ask for it and accept contributions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. I wish at this time to insert into the RECORD a letter from the Hon. R. P. Lamont, Secretary of Commerce; also a telegram from Mr. Taylor, president of the Chamber of Commerce in Paris.

PARIS, April 11, 1930.

Hon. SOL BLOOM,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

American Chamber of Commerce in France in full sympathy your resolution and hopes United States Government will accept invitation French Government to participate Colonial Exposition, Paris, 1931. We believe participation this exposition exceedingly helpful to American business in France.

TAYLOR, *President.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, April 7, 1930.

The honorable the ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am replying to your letter of March 31 concerning the Colonial Exposition and Exposition of Overseas Countries to be held in Paris in 1931 (your file W E: 851.607 AN/).

The suggestions in my letter of March 13 related to commercial good will and the strengthening of international commercial relations. The first commercial treaty made by the United States was negotiated in the early years of the Republic with France. My intention was to emphasize these trade factors, not the political elements.

The trend of trade between France and the United States has been singularly steady in its relative importance. The value of this commerce with France and the French Colonies for the past decade is shown in the inclosed tables and its relation to the total world trade of the United States is indicated.

Commercial groups in France and the United States, as well as the French Government, are placing considerable significance upon participation by the United States at this Colonial Exposition. The French have invariably taken part in the great international expositions held in the United States. In consideration of the commercial bonds between the two nations I feel that acceptance of the invitation and participation by the United States would be justifiable and would present a further indication of the cordial French-American relations that have existed for years.

Very sincerely,

R. P. LAMONT,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to ask for time in opposition. Any Member of Congress who follows a bill must necessarily obtain his information from the report, and, with all due consideration for the committee, I say that this report on this resolution is absolutely bare of any statement which shows that at any time an invitation was officially extended to the United States by the Government of France. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has read copies of the official invitation, and it is now in the RECORD. At least the House now knows that we have been officially invited. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I conferred with several members of the committee in respect to this resolution, and every member that I conferred with said that the resolution must have been considered in his absence, because he was not there. That also prompted me to look into it very carefully. The committee has reported an invitation from a foreign government and it is before the House. Naturally the House can not do anything else than accept the invitation or place the country in a most ungracious position. There is no doubt about that. I have my own views on the matter of colonization. I am sure the Government and our representatives will by statement and otherwise make it clear that the United States has no colonies. We surely will do nothing to embarrass our fellow citizens of Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, that is just exactly the statement that I expected the gentleman from New York to make. Everyone knows that he is eminently fair. All he wanted was proof that this resolution was correct and just.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And that the invitation was here.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; that we had received an official invitation.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I am sure that our representatives and departments will make it very clear that we are not presenting any of our territories as colonies, because we have not colonies.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, that point was mentioned in the committee. Of course we have no colonies, but we have overseas possessions.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Overseas territories.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Overseas possessions. We have overseas holdings, whether they be called possessions or territories.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. In other words, we do not consider our territorial fellow citizens under the same conditions as, for instance, France does the French colonies or Belgium does her colonies.

Mr. O'CONNELL. No.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. We say nothing in the resolution that indicates that.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman is aware that an effort is being made by the Executive to hold down appropriations. This calls for a sizable appropriation.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I wish the gentleman would refer that inquiry to members of the committee. I have troubles enough of my own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield some time to myself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There is a bill pending, introduced by the Commissioner of Porto Rico, to appropriate \$800,000 for building a lighthouse in Porto Rico, where the people, all of whom are citizens of the United States, and nearly all of whom are in poverty and great distress. Is that bill going to be called up to-day?

Mr. FISH. That bill is the last on the calendar, and it is doubtful if it will be reached. However, it is not in Porto Rico where it is proposed to erect this lighthouse, but in Santo Domingo.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Well, of course, the people of Santo Domingo are not citizens of the United States, although they, too, are mostly very poor. Hearings recently held in the Committee on the Territories disclosed the terrible distress of most of the 1,600,000 people in Porto Rico. Fully 600,000 of them are at the actual point of starvation; mothers are so underfed that their babies are nourished by the mothers chewing rice and trying to spit the rice chew into the babies' mouths. This and other evidence comes from Col. Theodore Roosevelt, the Governor of Porto Rico. That is where we ought to spend some money, and for that situation we might spare some time before adjournment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think the Committee on Appropriations will insert that item in the deficiency bill. I am not authorized to say so, but I hope that will be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am sincerely glad to hear that statement of some prospective additional relief for our Porto Rican American citizens. But let us also remember that times are very hard out in the States of our own country, as all of you will find out after we adjourn and you go to your homes.

Mr. FISH. I will say to the gentleman that when the lighthouse bill he refers to is under consideration at a future day I hope the gentleman will make that statement at that time.

This bill carries an authorization of \$250,000, but if we refuse to adopt this particular resolution to participate in the exposition at Paris it would be regarded almost as an unfriendly act, or at least as an ungracious act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, unless there are some further remarks to be made on the resolution, I will move that the committee do now rise and report it back to the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not care for further time, except to say that we do not desire to be ungracious or selfish, but that the more necessary things at home should be done first.

Mr. FISH. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the official invitations tendered by the French Ambassador at Washington to the Secretary of State for the participation of the Government of the United States in the Colonial International Exposition to be held in Paris in 1931.

[Translation]

EMBASSY OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC TO THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, January 2, 1930.

MR. SECRETARY OF STATE: By a note dated June 13 last your excellency's predecessor, in reply to a communication I sent him on April 6, 1927, informed me that the Government of the United States was not likely to be in a position to take official part in the Colonial International Exposition which the French Government has decided to hold in Paris in 1931.

Since the above-mentioned answer the embassy has had occasion to broach again the subject repeatedly with the Department of State. The commercial attaché also spoke with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce. I had myself the honor to speak with your excellency about it during a visit I made last fall to introduce to you the secretary-general of the contemplated exposition. I also had an opportunity to mention the subject to the Secretary of Commerce.

All those conversations were intended to stress with your excellency and the competent authorities of the American Government the importance the French Government would attach to an American representation, without which the intended international event would be incomplete. The United States, to be sure, has no colonial territory. But I wish to draw your excellency's attention to the fact that this is not to be an exposition confined to the colonies properly so called of the several powers. It is to be an exposition in which the leading powers of the world will take part with regard, besides their colonies, properly so called, to the territories or possessions in which they have especial interest. That is the reason why the phrase "colonies and countries beyond the seas" was added to "Colonial International Exposition of Paris." In this respect the American possessions of Porto Rico, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippine Islands, as also the West Indies, come within the class of territories beyond the sea contemplated above. The French Government believes it would be highly desirable to have the products, customs, traditions, etc., of the above-named territories represented by the same right as those of the possessions of the other countries.

I have, therefore, been instructed again to bring this question up to the Government of the United States and to renew the invitation I had the honor to extend two years ago.

In order to place your excellency in a position to give precise information to the authorities concerning the scope of the exposition, I have the honor to inclose herewith five copies of two documents written in English and containing information of a general nature and the regulations of the exposition, together with several plans of the site which it will occupy.

Begging your excellency kindly to see that these are forwarded to the authorities concerned, I take the liberty of expressing my Government's gratitude for such efforts as you may deem proper to make looking to a favorable decision from the Government of the United States.

Please accept, Mr. Secretary of State, the assurances of my highest consideration.

CLAUDEL.

[Translation]

EMBASSY OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC TO THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, April 6, 1927.

His Excellency Hon. FRANK B. KELLOGG,

Secretary of State of the United States.

MR. SECRETARY OF STATE: The French Government, by authority of the Parliament, has decided to organize, in 1929, an International Colonial Exposition in Paris. The main characteristics of that event are given in the note, a copy of which I inclose to your excellency.

The higher council of the exposition thought there might be occasion to invite not only the powers with colonies but also the countries producing articles like those of the French possessions beyond the seas. For that reason, Mr. Briand instructed me to send to the American Government an official invitation to participate in this exposition as the Government of the Republic attaches the greatest value to the adhesion of the United States.

In order to have the time needed for the preparation of foreign participations, Mr. Briand would like to know at the earliest possible date the answer your excellency may be pleased to return, which I am to report by telegraph. I shall shortly forward to your excellency copies of the general rules of the exposition and also the notice and general plan to be published on that occasion by the Minister of Colonies.

I may add that the Americans who would be designated to prepare the participation in that exposition might, for all additional information, directly communicate with Mr. Gabriel Angoulevant, Deputy Governor General of Colonies, Commissioner General of the International Colonial Exposition, at the Ministry of Colonies in Paris.

Be pleased to accept, etc.

CLAUDEL.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to appoint a commissioner general and two commissioners to represent the United States in the exposition, the amount of the compensation of each of whom not, however, to exceed \$10,000 per annum, shall be determined by the Secretary of State. The commissioner general shall prescribe the duties of the two commissioners and shall under the direction of the Secretary of State, (1) make all needful rules and regulations relative to the exhibits from this country and its overseas territories, and for the expenditures incident to the installation of such exhibits, and for the preparation of reports of the exposition and the general results thereof; (2) furnish such information to private exhibitors and prospective exhibitors as he may deem requisite and feasible; (3) make all proper arrangements for the preparation, transportation, installation, display, and care of the exhibits from this country and its overseas territories; (4) with reference to such exhibits from this country and its overseas territories, and reports, cooperate with and secure the assistance of the various executive departments and branches of the Government participating in the exposition, which departments and branches may, with the approval of the Secretary of State, designate officials or employees of their departments or branches to assist the commissioner general, but no such official or employee so designated shall receive a salary in excess of the amount which he has been receiving in the department or branch where employed, plus such reasonable additional allowance for expenses as may be deemed proper by the Secretary of State; (5) employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as may be necessary and fix their reasonable compensation; and (6) purchase such material, contract for such labor and services, and cause to be constructed such building as may be necessary to carry out the general purpose of this act. The heads of the various departments and branches of the Government are authorized, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, to collect and prepare suitable exhibits for display at the exposition, accompanied by appropriate descriptions in the French and English languages.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment on page 1, having to do with punctuation. Strike out the comma after the word "not," and after the word "how-

ever," in line 10, and insert a comma after the word "whom" in the same line.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman think it would improve it to strike out also the word "however"? I think that would be better.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Yes; and to strike out the "however."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORTON D. HULL]. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORTON D. HULL: Page 1, line 10, strike out the comma after the word "not," insert a comma after the word "whom," strike out the comma after the word "however," and strike out the word "however."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 1, line 8, changing the two commissioners to one. On page 2, line 3, make it singular, "commissioner" instead of "commissioners."

Mr. FISH. This resolution was carefully drawn in the committee, and unless there are good reasons to change it to one commissioner I hope the gentleman's amendment will not prevail.

Mr. BLOOM. I think one commissioner is enough. You have one general commissioner and one commissioner. And, furthermore, my colleague from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] spoke to me about it, and I agreed with him that it should be changed to one commissioner instead of two.

Mr. FISH. Then, you are simply doing this by request?

Mr. BLOOM. Both by request and at my own initiative.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLOOM: Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "two" and insert "one," and strike out the word "commissioners" and insert the word "commissioner."

On page 2, line 2, strike out the word "two" and insert the word "one," and strike out the word "commissioners" on line 3 of page 2 and insert the word "commissioner."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Officers and employees of the executive departments or branches of the Government in charge of or responsible for the safe-keeping of any property of this country and its oversea territories which is proposed to be exhibited, may permit such property, on the request of the commissioner general, to pass from their possession for the purpose of being transported to and from and exhibited at the exposition. At the close of the exposition, or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, if practicable, the commissioner general shall cause all such property to be returned to the respective departments and branches from which taken; and if the return of any such property is not practicable, he may, with the knowledge of the department or branch from which it was taken, and with the approval of the Secretary of State, make such disposition thereof as he may deem advisable and account therefor.

With a committee amendment as follows:

Page 3, line 18, after the word "exposition," insert the words "or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases."

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am in favor of this bill. Expositions promote good will and establish friendly relations among the nations that participate in them. They not only have commercial but cultural aspects which are desirable to all countries, but one like our own that can boast of so many schools, colleges, and universities, where the value of art in all of its forms, poetry, painting, sculpture, and music are encouraged and promoted. The origin of the city of New Orleans is, of course, so well known historically that I am not going to dwell on the fact at all; suffice it to say that it is the Paris of America, with a strong suggestion of Madrid and Seville, which makes it one of the most attractive cities on the continent. As the merits of

the bill have been made known very fully and felicitously by our colleague from New York [Mr. BLOOM], anything I might say would be, if not in the nature of an elaboration, akin to a supererogation. That last remark is for the benefit of my good friend, Congressman MOORE of Virginia, who delights in alliterations and near alliterations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. But before that request is granted I want to say that Congressman SOL BLOOM is a consistent advocate of expositions, believing they promote desirable results. He was and is one of the best friends the New Orleans Trade Exhibition has in this House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does the gentleman mean that the city of New Orleans had a French origin or a Celtic origin?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I am surprised at such a question coming from one of the Nestors of the House, whose knowledge of history and illuminating references to the wonders and the great men of the past have made him one of the most affectionate indispensables of the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Why bring that up? [Laughter.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I am glad that our genial friend has in such a friendly and facetious manner come into the debate and inspired me to tell him what he knows of course, and that while New Orleans owes many of its glories and much of its atmosphere to France and Spain, its architecture reminding one of the streets and buildings of Paris, Brussels, Rome, and Madrid, its life along all lines, social, commercial, financial, and industrial, have felt a beneficial and colorful influence from the Irish blood that is found in so many families not only of New Orleans but of Louisiana as a larger part of our country. Many of the finest plantations in our State bear Irish names. But in all seriousness, my colleagues, let us pass this bill. We owe such action to ourselves and to France. I might say we owe a friendly attitude to all of Europe at all times, for after all, as Clemenceau said when he was here, all Americans are extensions of European stock. But at this time of depression in world affairs and when the pending tariff bill does not tend to strengthen the ties of affection between us and other people, we should do what we can with this and other legislation to reestablish amicable relations.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. In order to defray the expenses hereinbefore specified and all and singular expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, the sum of \$250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended. All expenditures shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of State and payable upon his certification, but shall not be subject to the provisions of any law other than this act regulating or limiting the expenditure of public money, but this provision shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit or permit any indebtedness to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALMON: Page 4, line 5, strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$125,000."

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, as has been said by the distinguished Member from the State of Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], times are hard. Money is scarce. We have had, and still have, what we might term a great financial crisis. The President of the United States has urged us to economize in the making of our appropriations. The distinguished author of this bill has reduced the expense incident to it by striking out the provision for one of the commissioners who is to receive a salary of \$10,000 per year.

Bills of this kind authorizing appropriations usually come back with another request, after the exposition is over, for enough money to make good the deficit. I have no doubt that will be done in this case, and Congress will appropriate whatever is necessary to make good the deficit. I trust the members of this committee will bear in mind that conditions are

unusual. It may not be proper to decline this invitation, but I do say that we should have some regard to the financial condition of our country. Some of the men who are going to serve in this capacity would, no doubt, be willing to serve without any salary and simply receive their expenses. For that reason it seems to me that at the present time \$125,000, which is quite a good deal of money, is sufficient to authorize for this exposition. For that reason I urge the passage of my amendment.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amount, \$250,000 authorized in the resolution, has the approval of the administration and of the Budget. It is little enough, I will say to the gentlemen, for the participation of the United States of America in any great exposition to be held in France. The French Government has consistently accepted all of our invitations to American expositions since the centennial of 1876. France has on numerous occasions appropriated large sums of money, far greater than is authorized in this resolution, to send exhibits to the United States and participate in our expositions. The only objection I have to the resolution is that the amount is not large enough. I should be glad to vote for twice as much, but in view of the fact that the administration and the Budget have recommended \$250,000, I hope the House will sustain that amount. Besides it has the unanimous support of the committee.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. What is going to be done with all this money? The gentleman stated he would be glad to vote for twice this amount. I am afraid they will be coming back for more money. That is the thing that we expect. They will be coming back asking for more money. The other day we attempted to pass a bill to rehabilitate people who were disabled in industry and this amount, according to the statistics, would rehabilitate several thousand of them, and we could not pass that legislation on account of the Budget. Now \$250,000 is asked for, and the gentleman from New York makes the statement that he would support \$500,000. What is going to be done with all of this money?

Mr. FISH. I will say to the gentleman this amount has been well considered, and the State Department believes that the entire sum of \$250,000 will be required. It is believed that this amount will be adequate to fulfill our share and our contribution to this exposition. Furthermore, I would point out to the gentleman that we do a large trade with France and a large trade with her colonial empires, such as Morocco, and this exposition will help our trade. It would be almost a disaster to cut down the amount and minimize this exposition, when the feeling in France is intense on the tariff question. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the amendment.

Mr. PATTERSON. I did not know the feeling was intense on the tariff question. That is something new, coming from that quarter.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that with present conditions facing us at home we should accept the amendment and appropriate \$125,000 rather than a quarter of a million dollars.

I would like to say to my colleagues that I fear you are inclined to forget the acuteness of present economic conditions. For instance, I have a number of soldiers in my district, who are disabled, who can not get hospitalization because the facilities are not available in veterans' hospitals on account of sufficient money not being appropriated. We are trying to get soldiers' homes to take care of those who are not subject to hospitalization but who are subject to care in homes, but our appropriations are not granted. Only this morning two very fine young men around 30 years of age came to my office. One of them was an experienced law clerk and a skilled office man. The other was a fairly good workman and had clerical training. They said: "We have been to New York; we have been all over Washington. We can not find any kind of employment. What is wrong? Why can't we find something to do? We direly need employment."

When we know that these conditions exist, when we know that our people are hungry, in the worst panic in the history of our country, and with the great unemployment, it seems to me, my colleagues, we should economize. A number of appropriations were asked for which are absolutely needed by our people. It seems to me we could very well cut this down to \$125,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. The commissioner general, with the approval of the Secretary of State, may receive from any source contributions to aid in carrying out the general purpose of this act, but the same shall be expended and

accounted for in the same manner as any appropriation which may be made under authority of this act. The commissioner general is also authorized to receive contributions of material to aid in carrying out the general purpose of this act, and at the close of the exposition or when the connection of the Government of the United States herewith ceases, under the direction of the Secretary of State, shall dispose of any such portion thereof as may be unused, and any building which may have been constructed and account therefor.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 1, strike out the word "herewith" and insert the word "therewith."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to make a statement. The Clerk has called the attention of the Chair to the effect of the amendment in line 2, on page 2, where the word "two" was changed to "one." The reading is rather strange, to the effect that the commissioner general shall prescribe the duties of the one commissioner. The Chair suggests that by unanimous consent the action of the committee in adopting that amendment as to the word "two" be vacated and the word "two" stricken out without any substitution therefor. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, merely for the purpose of suggesting that the word "commissioners" should be changed to "commissioner."

The CHAIRMAN. The understanding of the Chair is that that action has been taken. The Chair suggested merely the striking out of the word "two" without any substitution therefor.

Mr. HOCH. But the word "commissioners" should be changed to "commissioner."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is under the impression that he put the question on vacating the action as to the amendment with reference only to the word "two." However, without objection, the RECORD will be made to conform to the suggestion of the gentleman from Kansas.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDELOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. J. Res. 311) for the participation of the United States in an exposition to be held at Paris, France, in 1931, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FISH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

ADDRESS OF DR. JULIUS KLEIN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address by Dr. Julius Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, on the subject of roads as business builders, delivered through the courtesy of the Columbia Broadcasting system on May 25, 1930.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

ROADS AS BUSINESS BUILDERS

The meaning of good roads in the social life and commercial activity of the United States was brought home to us very vividly a few short weeks ago when President Hoover signed the Dowell bill—certainly one of the most notable pieces of legislation in the history of the highway program in this country. This act appropriates \$300,000,000 of Federal money to aid the States in the consideration of roads during the next three years. Its economic importance would be difficult to exaggerate.

The subject of the commercial value of roads is particularly timely now, I feel, because reports recently made to Secretary Lamont by the governors of 35 States indicate really striking activity in highway construction this year. Thirty States report increases, and 16 of the governors announce contract awards so far this year, 100 per cent or more above the same period last year. Contracts for highways reached the total of \$196,678,000 during the first four months of 1930, against \$142,668,000 during the corresponding period of 1929. The greatest relative increases, I find, are in Ohio and Idaho; in the former State the road-construction awards for the first three months of this year were eleven times greater than in the corresponding quarter a year ago, while Idaho shows awards more than ninety times as large as last year. Arkansas is now in the midst of a highway-development program on which \$25,000,000 will be expended this year.

Secretary Lamont has expressed the opinion that the great increase in early season highway construction is a matter of national moment. It represents a substantial contribution to the stabilization of business. There is reason to believe that the large volume of early awards is especially significant as a means of spreading employment throughout the year. I shall say more, in a few moments, about the business value of the highways after they have been completed, but I want to emphasize now that highway-construction operations under way involve the use of millions of tons of material drawn from widely separated sources, and they provide employment (both directly and indirectly) over broader areas than any other type of public work. It is calculated that nearly 50 cents of each dollar spent for highway building and maintenance is paid for the labor involved. And this does not mean merely the able shovel wielders out in the hot sun; it includes makers of cement, in distant cities, chemists in explosive plants, steel workers, lumber-yard employees, and countless others who contribute to the creation or selling of road and bridge materials. So workers everywhere should benefit greatly from these road-building enterprises, and transportation agencies will derive appreciable profits from the shipment of the essential equipment and material.

The extent and quality of a nation's roadways determine, to a high degree, its rank in the material civilization of the present day. For contemporary commerce the highway is absolutely indispensable. Backwardness and sluggishness, or turmoil and bewilderment, may result from a lack of highways over any considerable area of the surface of the earth.

What one may call, perhaps, the "religion of the road" was established for the modern world by the practice of ancient Rome. The Roman road—incomparably magnificent in the skill and solidity of its construction and in the undeviating pertinacity with which it was thrust out in every direction from the city by the Tiber—enabled Rome to become the mistress of the Mediterranean and of practically all the then known world. Those roads formed an intricate and gigantic network stretching out to Spain, to Scotland, to Germany, to Syria, to Egypt, and through northern Africa. Sometimes as much as 3 feet thick and almost as enduring as primeval rock these Roman highways struck straight for definite goals. They penetrated forests, surmounted morasses, formed an avenue of life through barren wildernesses, or functioned as the busy arteries of a rich and smiling countryside. Over them thundered the Roman legions, and in the wake of the legions came the Roman law, the "Roman peace."

Most of our early American statesmen were passionately enthusiastic about the value of roads. We find that brilliant Carolinian, Calhoun, saying, in the year 1819, that "a judicious system of roads, constructed for the convenience of commerce and the transportation of the mail, would—by consolidating our Union and increasing our wealth and fiscal capacity—add greatly to our resources."

So in those early days there was a period that was called "the turnpike era," when roads were penetrating far into the stagnant rural "back country" and when turnpike and bridge companies became a veritable "craze." In swampy places the people had so-called corduroy roads, consisting of logs placed close together and covered lightly with earth. I must not forget to mention the "Wilderness Road," which Daniel Boone hewed out from North Carolina to the heart of the Kentucky country. It was ungraded, it was partly obstructed by stumps, it was full of annoying cavities, but over it journeyed the grandparents of Abraham Lincoln. Then there was the famous "National Road," which was started from Cumberland, Md., in 1808; as Malcolm Keir reminds us, it took 3 Presidents, 10 Congresses, and 14 governmental acts to get that road even as far as Wheeling, W. Va., about 125 miles, within a period of nine years.

Occasionally, even in the early nineteenth century in this country, one might see the typical 2-wheeled peasant's cart of Europe, but the real long-distance freight carrier came to be the Conestoga wagon, high from the ground, to clear those stumps and rocks, and with a peculiar curved shape, actually a crude boat on wheels, useful in crossing deep streams.

All that life upon the highways was extremely picturesque, but uncomfortable and trying, because, by our modern standards, those roads were very poor.

Most of us Americans who are not excessively young can recall very well the "pregood-roads" days out in the country districts—the narrow

dirt strips; the ruts and bogs and bumps and ridges; the treacherous holes where the old gray mare might stumble and collapse; the jolting and bouncing; the "slithering" through long sections of the highway, which, as a result of rains, had become little more than swamps. It was a task in those days—a feat of endurance and hardihood in many cases—merely to make 15 miles to "get to town" in a buggy or in one of the hard, lumbering, old-fashioned country wagons, to say nothing of undertaking any prolonged or extended trips.

And what, we may ask, was the social effect—or, more specifically, the business effect—of that condition? Transportation was impeded. The movement of people and of goods was slowed up, made difficult. There was a natural hesitation about venturing far from one's own balliwick in any case where roads alone were available for movement. The tendency was one of isolation, of segregation, of social and commercial life concentrating contentedly in and around a countless number of small centers—the crossroads settlement, the hamlet, the village, the little city.

Each of these centers enjoyed a rather high degree of economic independence, being in large measure self-sufficient and self-sustaining. Each had its "sphere of influence," in which a spirit of neighborly understanding reigned and commercial interchange was restricted very largely by the geographic limitations of the given region. A business establishment in any one of these more or less isolated centers had a trade it could depend upon as long as its service should continue satisfactory—a trade that came to it naturally and inevitably in consequence of the lack of hard, smooth highways and speedy transportation.

Good roads have revolutionized the business of the Nation, and "the end is not yet." A profound change in commercial habits has been wrought by those thousands and thousands of miles of sleek, gleaming road ribbons that we have created for ourselves and over which we dash so swiftly and exultantly, with the exhilarating sensation that we are setting space at naught.

Under the resistless compulsion of the automobile's spread, the good-roads movement here in the United States has advanced with giant strides. Let us hark back for a moment to the year 1904. How much money do you think was being expended by State and Federal Governments in that year for rural highways? Only a little more than two and one-half million dollars—incredible as that tiny figure may seem to us to-day. In 1928, the most recent year for which we can obtain complete statistics, the comparable figure was more than \$827,000,000—three hundred and thirty times as much. And, in addition to that huge sum, the expenditures of counties and other local governments for roads in 1928 reached a total of \$832,000,000. Since 1921 the aggregate expenditures for roads in this country have mounted above a billion dollars every year.

According to the very best estimates I can obtain, we now have in the United States more than 3,000,000 miles of public roads. This, to be sure, includes roads of all classes outside the limits of municipalities and is made up largely of local roads of small importance. We have 660,000 miles of surfaced roads. The Federal-aid system—which includes the roads of highest traffic importance—comprises nearly 190,000 miles, a system of splendid highways which would extend almost eight times around the world if it were in one unbroken road. Our roads form an admirable system in many respects, but it is widely felt that we need more.

I spoke a moment ago about the enormous annual expenditure in this country for road construction. But, as Mr. T. H. MacDonald, the chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, has pointed out, this expenditure equals only one-half of the annual expenditure by owners of motor vehicles for gasoline alone. The public applauds the expenditure of money for good roads; it recognizes that this use of funds is economically wise, farsighted, and remunerative. Because of the existence of the fine hard-surfaced roads the great motoring public spends vastly less than it otherwise might for such items as gasoline, operating expenses, and upkeep of cars. There can be no doubt whatever that the amount thus saved exceeds the sums that we have been spending on our roads.

During 1929, by the way, our motor vehicles probably consumed more than 14,000,000,000 gallons of gasoline. If we figure 12 miles per gallon—which appears to be the approximate average consumption by vehicles of all makes and types—we are compelled to conclude that the motor cars of the United States traveled more than 168,000,000,000 vehicle-miles last year. As Mr. MacDonald says, this is "an almost inconceivable figure," made possible by our improved roads and streets.

I know I need not stress the commercial value and the value in health and pleasure of such great modern roads as the Lincoln Highway, the Dixie Highway, the Boston Post Road, the Lee Highway, the Yellowstone Trail, the Pacific Highway from British Columbia to San Diego, and numerous others that come readily to mind. Along these superb roads our millions of motor cars whirl us over ground that once resounded to the clatter of the roofs of red warriors—that witnessed the desperate struggles and determined advance of the covered-wagon days—or that shook under the tread of the gallant heroes wearing the uniforms of blue and gray.

We all know what good highways have meant to the automobile industry in all its ramifications and affiliated branches, how motor-car regis-

trations have leaped upward with the construction of fine roads, bringing prosperity to the manufacturers, to the manifold industries that are tributary to such manufacture, and to the many phases of automotive service and accessory supply. The automobile forms indisputably a basic key industry in this country; it provides employment for 1 out of every 10 of the workers in the United States. Therefore the business benefits from good roads in this single major aspect may justly be called immense.

Good roads have helped the farmer by cutting the cost of getting his produce to market. They have reduced the expense of merchandising, and the economies thus effected have meant money in the pockets of every single one of us. The farmer can ship perishable commodities to the city much more readily; such is the case with all sorts of "garden truck" and fruit that ripens on the trees. The shipper does not need to wait to accumulate a carload lot; he can deliver the produce right into market and dispose of them immediately to good advantage. I find that in certain instances the supply of milk to cities is carried on over the highways to the extent of more than 90 per cent of the quantity consumed. Activity of this kind has taken some traffic from the railways—but in general the operation of trucks over the roads is helpful to the rail lines; the trucks serve as "feeders," accessories, tapping new territory, engendering new productive efforts.

For the manufacturer, there is the possibility of swift "interplant exchange" of commodities in course of production—an exchange accomplished by truck—in cases where it is most convenient to have one operation performed in one place and other operations elsewhere.

As regards passenger traffic in other than private cars, I need only say that to-day busses carry more than 3,000,000,000 passengers annually in the United States—twenty-four times the total population of the country.

The feasibility of prompt delivery represents one of the greatest commercial contributions of the motor road. The small-town store can keep a fresher stock, can enjoy a quicker turnover, is relieved of the necessity of having so large an "inventory," and can "keep up with the styles" much more readily than in the past. The isolation, the "self-centered" quality, of the smaller community has been broken down.

In numerous respects the result has been advantageous, but there is, I must admit, another vital element here which many small-town merchants may regard with apprehension; namely, the fact that their once exclusive province has been laid open to invasion by business organizations spreading from the cities, and the motor road has been responsible in part for such incursions. This is so big a subject that I shall defer it till another talk on the general theme of the business future of the small town along with the rôle that the modern road is playing in the decentralization of industry and the rise of factories in smaller centers.

To illustrate effectively the specific business benefits from roads, let us take just one State as an example. North Carolina should serve admirably as a "test case." Between 1919 and 1926 that State constructed \$125,000,000 worth of highways. And with what economic result? The number of farms in the State was increased by 13,000 during a period when the number of farms for the country as a whole was falling off. It may be objected that, in view of existing surpluses, greater agricultural production is not needed; but the point to be borne in mind is that the roads make it possible to organize the situation more definitely and efficiently.

Forty cooperative farm marketing associations were developed in North Carolina—engaged in shipping carload after carload of poultry, eggs, hogs, fruits, and vegetables that the State formerly never grew for outside sale. Roadside markets and city curb markets—the immediate result of the good roads—stimulated the growing of truck produce and formed an outlet for the farm surplus. With the cash thus obtained the farm women put modern conveniences into their homes, dressed themselves and their children better, painted their houses, and beautified their yards, thus creating substantial business for a variety of merchants. The true value of North Carolina property multiplied eight times between 1900 and 1926, while the entire United States was increasing the true value of property by four times. Through the new roads the State was enabled to recover its "lost provinces"—those sections to the far east and west that were formerly foreign to the State so far as transportation connections of any kind were concerned. As a direct accompaniment and outgrowth of the new good road, North Carolina built consolidated rural schools valued at \$35,000,000. At Asheville there was a 200 per cent increase in dollar business between 1919 and 1926, the period during which the good roads were built. In the Winston-Salem trade territory, the retailers reported a 65 per cent increase in purchasing power per capita. The Greensboro Chamber of Commerce testified that the good roads widened the retail-trade territory of the city to an irregular area extending from 15 to 50 miles. The fine roads have given a simply tremendous boost to the State's tourist traffic. In 1920 North Carolina itself had about 140,000 motor vehicles; now it has not less than 485,000.

Here we see concrete proofs of the business benefits from highways—not idle theories but authentic and attested facts. And since those facts were summarized four years ago no doubt the benefits have multiplied.

The modern motor road has given to the business man, as an individual, a wonderful freedom of movement—an ease and flexibility in the scope of his activity—which he never enjoyed in other eras. It has relaxed all kinds of once-rigid commercial bonds. It has helped to make business fluent, copious, easily impelled and diffused, swift to reach its goals—and vastly more complex than anything our fathers knew.

One great problem that the motor road has brought is that of highway safety. There is no blinking the fact that countless tragedies have marred its use. What can we do to prevent it from becoming a modern Moloch, to which precious lives are sacrificed in a frantic, heedless speed orgy? This question of safety on our streets and roads is an enormously vital one, with important business bearings. I shall try to say something about it next Sunday at this time.

Until then, good-night—and thank you very much.

RENEWAL OF PASSPORTS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up the bill (H. R. 10826) to provide for the renewal of passports.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar, and the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10826, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10826, which the Clerk will report.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the issue and validity of passports, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1926 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 22, sec. 217a), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That the validity of a passport or visa shall be limited to a period of two years: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may limit the validity of a passport or visa to a shorter period and that no immigration visa shall be issued for a longer period than that specified in the immigration act of 1924 or amendments thereto: *And provided further*, That a passport may be renewed, without additional charge, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State, for periods of not to exceed two years each, but the final date of expiration shall not be more than six years from the original date of issue.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague from New York [Mr. O'CONNELL].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I shall ask recognition in opposition at the proper time.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill amends the existing passport law so as to permit the holder of an American passport to renew it so that it would be valid for a period of six years instead of for two years, as under the present law. The purpose of the amendment herein proposed is perfectly plain and is unanimously recommended by our committee after exhaustive hearings and after the receipt of letters of indorsement from leading business men in all sections of the country.

Section 2 of existing law reads as follows:

That the validity of a passport or visa shall be limited to a period of two years: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may limit the validity of a passport or visa to a shorter period and that no immigration visa shall be issued for a longer period than that specified in the immigration act of 1924 or amendments thereto: *And provided further*, That a passport may be renewed without any additional charge under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State, and at his discretion to bona fide teachers, but the final date of expiration shall not be more than four years from the original date of issue.

This made a distinction between the business man or tourist and the teacher.

At the hearings representatives appeared and were heard from the Department of State and the Department of Commerce, the two branches of the Government immediately concerned with this legislation, which has their hearty indorsement. The principal thing that this amendment seeks to obtain is the matter of convenience to those of our people who, for business or pleasure, find it necessary to go abroad, and who in the past complain of the inconvenience that comes to them in connection not only with the necessity of obtaining frequent

passports but the many visas the traveler is compelled to get at great expense in order to conduct his business in many of the foreign countries he must visit in the pursuance of his profession. However, practically every witness that appeared before the committee in the course of the hearing stressed the matter of convenience as the most desirable feature of the proposed amendment. It was brought out that many governments furnish their nationals with passports that extend for five years; namely, Great Britain, Canada, Germany, Switzerland, and Denmark, and as a result the responsibility of a great deal of the trade that possibly comes to our country, as well as to South American countries, was perhaps due to the attitude of the countries I have specified to make it easier for the business men and their nationals of every kind to travel freely abroad.

The opinion prevailed among the witnesses that if we could say to the travelers of this country that the passport is made available for six years, merely by a renewal every two years for a period of three times, we would establish not only a greater contact and a greater business with other countries but would be taking a far step forward toward promoting understanding, good will, and fellowship among the nations of the world.

The Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce indorsed the proposed amendment before the committee upon the statements made to the department repeatedly by business men at home and abroad. Being in touch with every American firm that is doing any foreign business they are constantly hearing from these houses of the difficulties connected with our passport situation. Many of these are large representative organizations, and the costs of the passport are not of such vital consideration. It is the convenience, the ability to obtain the passport renewal at short notice without the necessity of having to make an application for a new passport, with consequent delay, that works the hardship, and in many cases a monetary loss, to our traveler business men who pursue their trade in foreign countries. Under this amendment our merchants or their representatives would be permitted to leave for Europe in a few hours in an emergency by sending a messenger to the passport office for a renewal, and thus be enabled to catch a ship. We are therefore encouraging our business men in promoting our foreign trade and placing our merchants upon an equality with the business representative of all other nations.

In brief, this is a summary of how the committee feels with reference to this proposed amendment, and I may say that we had before the committee Mr. Peter Fletcher, president National Council of American Importers and Traders (Inc.), New York City; Mr. S. C. Mead, secretary and treasurer Merchants Association of New York, New York City; Mr. C. A. Richards, chairman Foreign Trade Commission, Merchants Association of New York; Mr. C. B. Dodds, Washington representative, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Ivan E. Goodner, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; Mr. David Lindsay, assistant passenger traffic manager International Mercantile Marine Co., New York City; Mr. W. L. Cooper, director Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Wilbur J. Carr, Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

In addition to this we have received hundreds and hundreds of letters from the business people of the country indorsing this proposed legislation. The bill comes with a unanimous report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs and it is the firm conviction of the committee that this is a step in the right direction and one that will turn out very satisfactorily to all those who have occasion to use the passport service.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. PATTERSON. I want to ask about the charge of \$5 to teachers.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I may say to my friend that that is an amendment that was offered in committee to which I understand there is some opposition.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is my opposition to the bill.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Under the law as it stands at the present time teachers are given the same consideration that any other traveler receives in the matter of the cost of the original fee, but they have four years as the life of their passport, whereas the business man or other traveler has but two years. This amendment was offered by certain members of the committee and it was not objectionable to the author of the bill and he accepted it.

Mr. PATTERSON. Do I understand that a business man would only pay \$2?

Mr. O'CONNELL. No; the business man pays an original fee of \$10 and at the end of each two years, if he cares to renew the passport, he pays \$2 additional. The teacher gets

a passport for the same period of time, which is six years, and pays the original fee of \$5 and \$2 with each renewal of two years.

Mr. PRALL. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. PRALL. Is it not the fact that all the large civic bodies and business men's organizations of the country have indorsed this bill?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes. I thank my colleague from New York for his contribution. I have made some reference to that, and in the back of the hearings we have printed about one-half of the names of people from whom we have heard.

I may say to my friend that the idea in granting this concession to the teachers is that in the judgment of the members of the committee, sending a teacher abroad or having a teacher pay his or her own expenses to a foreign country makes such a teacher more valuable when he or she comes back to the schools of our own country. They come back endowed with additional knowledge and they are better informed on subjects that are of interest to their pupils, and they also enlarge their knowledge of conditions, not only at home but abroad. For this reason the committee felt they ought to continue the consideration which the teacher has heretofore received.

Mr. PRALL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes.

Mr. PRALL. Does the gentleman understand that a teacher gets credit in certain examinations for traveling, and it also gives them certain credit in their standing in the departments of education? I know that is true of New York.

Mr. O'CONNELL. That information, coming from my colleague from New York [Mr. PRALL], who for several years was the distinguished president of the Board of Education of Greater New York, is a real contribution, and I thank him for it. I did not know that to be the fact.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the bill.

Gentlemen, my objection to the bill is the proviso which has been referred to in the questions asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNELL] who has just relinquished the floor. The renewal features of the bill are desirable. There is no reason why an American citizen who has a passport should have to make a new application every two years. By simply submitting his old application he would receive a renewal, and this is desirable. Now, we come to the proviso which reads, "that the charge for the issue of an original passport to a bona fide teacher, so determined to be by the Secretary of State, shall be \$5." Why not make it \$5 for everybody? That would remove all discriminatory features of the bill.

The original charge for a passport is \$10. Gentlemen, it is wrong to make any discrimination in fees of any kind at any time in a democracy. I will grant the great advantage of teachers going abroad to study, but let me suggest if you put teachers there, you might as well put students. If you put students there, you might as well put artists. Then, if you put artists there, you might as well put clergymen. If you put clergymen, you might as well put veterans.

Mr. PRALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. PRALL. Is it not true that all transportation lines—steamship companies and others—give half rates to ministers and clergymen?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And different accommodation; but this passport is just the same as any other passport. Sure, one can go across in the tourist class, but I know my distinguished friend does not go in the tourist class.

Mr. PRALL. Is it not the fact that they get good accommodations?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes; but they do not get the same accommodations.

Mr. PRALL. They get the same accommodations at the price ordinarily asked.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. They are good accommodations.

Mr. PRALL. What is the difference between this and railroad transportation?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. You do not have to get a passport to travel on a train in this country—we are talking about steamship transportation for the purpose of traveling in foreign countries. If you are going to give this to teachers, there will be an amendment for students, and then for other classes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The law has favored teachers in other particulars. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] introduced an amendment, now the present law, where teachers had the right of renewal for two more years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; but here you will find a communication from the Department of State where it approves of your renewal and says this:

The department favors the passage of the proposed bill, which provides a more liberal period of validity for passports issued to all classes of American citizens alike and eliminates the discrimination now existing in favor of teachers whose passports at present are extended for a period of two years beyond the period of validity allowed under the law for passports issued to all other classes of citizens.

That is the letter from the Department of State.

Mr. LINTHICUM. This is an amendment by the committee, and the committee is right.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Department of State is right, and the committee is wrong, because it is bad to establish such a discrimination. If you want to make it \$5 for everybody, I will gladly go along.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. You could not put the fee at \$5 unless other countries do the same. It would be impossible for the department to get consent of other nations.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman refers to the reciprocal rights under the treaty for visas. This is different. We can charge anything to our nationals.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. ROMJUE. Do not we have a discrimination made in people coming to this country, like physicians, artists, and so forth? Do we not discriminate in their favor and allow them to come in with more freedom?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; if they come here to stay permanently they must come in under the quota. If they come under a contract to perform, they can come in under treaty rights.

Mr. ROMJUE. But they are given greater rights by reason of the calling that they are engaged in.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. It seems to me that there is no difference in principle.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But why do they pick out school-teachers; why not put in students?

Mr. ROMJUE. It might be well to include students. But it is no argument against school-teachers that students are not included.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How about clergymen who want to go to the Holy Land?

Mr. ROMJUE. They might be included.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Once you start to discriminate there will be no end. The only fair way is to strike out the proviso and treat all alike.

Mr. PRALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. PRALL. Is it not the gentleman's information that the most of these teachers in going abroad do so for educational purposes?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, yes. I suggest we make it \$5 for all. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] and I usually agree on matters, but it seems we differ as to this provision as to teachers. Teachers, as a rule, do not get very large salaries, and dollars to many of them are as big as cart wheels. Wherever we can help the teachers in securing more knowledge that they may bring back to use in their classrooms and impart to their pupils we should do it. The present law carries a provision that a teacher may have a passport renewed for the term of four years. So this provision for \$5 does not do any more than the present provision, because if the teacher renews the passport for four years she would pay only \$10. This provision I think as provided in this amendment would do much good for teachers. There are many teachers who go abroad. They go probably only once in a lifetime and they do not desire a renewal of the passport.

If you charge them \$10, they always pay the \$10, but with business men going abroad, they get a passport, and they pay the \$10 and they get a renewal, two renewals, and they can extend it for six years. This provision does not make it so hard on the teacher who goes abroad only once. I think you gentleman know just how it is in reference to teachers. They get up a group and go abroad, and visit places which would be of interest to their pupils and to themselves. It seems to me that the provision for the teachers charging them only \$5 is entirely a proper provision, and I hope it will prevail.

Mr. PRALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. PRALL. Does the gentleman know that it is a fact that the departments are now granting sabbatical leave to teachers in order that they may go abroad and acquire knowledge to impart to children?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know it, but if the gentleman says so, I am sure it is correct.

Mr. PRALL. That is correct.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do know this. There is no knowledge which you can have which is better than the knowledge you get from traveling and seeing places personally. A personal view of a place remains with you for a lifetime, and you can explain it to people, but merely reading about it, even seeing moving pictures, does not give the same result. I hope the amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further general debate, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the issue and validity of passports, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1926 (U. S. C., Suppl. III, title 22, sec. 217a), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That the validity of a passport or visa shall be limited to a period of two years: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may limit the validity of a passport or visa to a shorter period and that no immigration visa shall be issued for a longer period than that specified in the immigration act of 1924 or amendments thereto: *And provided further*, That a passport may be renewed, without additional charge under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State, for a period of not to exceed two years each, but the final date of expiration shall not be more than six years from the original date of issue."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "renewed," strike out "without additional charge" and insert "upon the payment of \$2."

Line 7, strike out the period at the end of the line, insert a colon, and the following: "*And provided further*, That the charge for the issue of an original passport to a bona fide teacher, so determined to be by the Secretary of State, shall be \$5."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The first committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the second committee amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the second committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "to a bona fide teacher, so determined to be by the Secretary of State."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the committee amendment as it will be if the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

And provided further, That the charge for the issue of an original passport shall be \$5.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the bill as introduced in the House I would have no objection to, but to the committee amendment which provides a discrimination in favor of one class of our people as to the fee for a passport I do object. If the committee amendment is agreed to we then will have teachers paying \$5 for a passport and everyone else paying \$10.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. For the past six years the teacher has had the advantage of the four years' life of the passport, whereas the regular business man or the tourist has had but two years.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; and that very discrimination gave rise to criticism and to agitation which has helped bring about this legislation removing that discrimination; but when the committee proceeds to remove that discrimination they turn to another one; and, without desiring to criticize the committee, that is the effect of what they have done. I have proposed an amendment that does not disturb the change that is proposed with reference to renewals; but it takes away this new discrimination without injuring the teachers at all. That is to say, if my amendment be adopted not only the teacher will get his passport for \$5 but every other citizen will get his for \$5.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. COLE. Would it not be better to strike out the special concession to teachers and leave the price of the passport as it is in the bill at \$10, in view of the fact that we are permitting these passports to be renewed? It seems to me that the price of \$10 is cheap enough.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the present law is \$10. The committee recommends \$5 for teachers. My amendment proposes \$5 for everyone. To 19 out of every 20 who go abroad, and I am only estimating, it is quite immaterial what we do with reference to renewals. They do not make more than one trip in four or five years, so that the original fee is the only one that affects the great majority of those who go abroad. Those who do go abroad frequently, of course, receive the benefit of the earlier part of the bill. I have believed for a long time that this Government has been charging fees that are higher than they ought to be for passports and visas, and here is an opportunity now to correct the situation with reference to the passport fee. I have a letter from the Detroit Board of Commerce under date of May 19, which reads:

DEAR MR. CRAMTON: The foreign trade committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce has at times expressed its desire for alleviation of passport regulations.

We would, therefore, urge your support of Representative O'CONNELL and the passage of his bill, H. R. 10826.

Michigan foreign trade has reached \$1,000,000 a day. Upon its continuance depends Michigan's prosperity. All measures that facilitate our salesmen journeying overseas and increase visits from foreign merchants deserves special support.

Yours very truly,

L. G. MACOMBER, *Director.*

Under the same date I have a letter from the New York Board of Trade signed by M. D. Griffith, general manager. It refers to the Copeland bill, similar to this bill before us.

NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE (INC.),

New York City, May 19, 1930.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are inclosing you a copy of the report which was presented at our regular monthly meeting last Wednesday by our special committee on passports, and which was approved thereat, including resolution unanimously indorsing Senate bill 2627, known as the Copeland bill, which not only extends the life of the passport from two to six years, without extra charge, but also reduces the passport fee from the war-time basis of \$10 (ten times as much as it was before the war) to a more moderate basis of \$5.

We understand that H. R. 10828, known as the O'Connell bill, which has been reported out of committee amended is to come before the House in general session some time this week.

We, therefore, desire to recall your attention to the facts in brief, and solicit your cooperation in amending the O'Connell bill to conform to the Copeland bill, or, even if practical, to reduce the passport fee still lower than is at present provided.

The fact that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in answer to our earnest plea at its hearing in Washington on May 15, representing the business men of this city and thousands of persons of moderate means who travel in one class and tourist cabin, have conceded that passport fees are too high by reducing them to \$5, but only in the case of school-teachers. We would respectfully point out that this is distinctly class legislation, because you are benefiting one class only while leaving the many others—professional or so-called "white-collar" class—to pay an excessive passport fee.

We would remind you that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, this board, and many chambers of commerce and boards of trade throughout the United States, whose names can be furnished upon request, have for some time demanded that passport fees be reduced to a nominal basis, and, in addition, many Members of the House and Senate have written to this board declaring that they would support such a move.

It may be of interest for you to know that within the last week or two the French Government, through its Chamber of Deputies by regular vote, abolished all embarkation and debarkation fees, so as to remove all "travel barriers" against American tourists.

Very respectfully yours,

M. D. GRIFFITH, *General Manager.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. According to my recollection, in Italy during the last year all the visa fees were done away with. The general tendency is in that direction.

So far as the cost to the Government is concerned, \$5 very well covers it, and more too. To charge \$10 is engaging in the business at a profit. I can not see that the conditions justify

financing the Government by charges to those going abroad, not only teachers but those in the medical profession or other professions. Others who receive benefits thereby should have the same benefits as teachers.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Can the gentleman give us an idea as to the amount received from the present passport fees?

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is \$2,700,000.

Mr. O'CONNELL. The passport fees collected during the fiscal year 1929 by the department were \$1,837,502, in the field \$250,288, making a total for passport fees of \$2,087,790. The visa fees collected during the fiscal year amounted to \$3,416,884. The total fees collected during the fiscal year 1929 in connection with passports and visas amounted to \$5,504,674.

Mr. CRAMTON. In view of the expressions from the business men of the country, I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this matter was gone into very fully by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and careful consideration was given to the whole proposition. To reduce the charge to \$5 would cut off an income to the Government of over a million dollars.

The Government now receives from the Foreign Service somewhere around the sum of \$7,000,000, and that \$7,000,000 has enabled the Government to give far greater service to the traveling public and to the business interests of the country than they otherwise would have received.

This Congress has voted \$10,000,000 for the construction of embassies and consulates throughout the world. It has voted out only recently a bill introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] which will provide fuel, heat, and light to those employed in the Foreign Service.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman mean that an individual making rarely a trip abroad should be charged so that funds so derived may be applied to the building of an embassy in Paris, for example?

Mr. LINTHICUM. If they get the benefit from it, I do not think they would object. That is not all. You know that the traveling public, and especially business abroad, are the ones benefited by the Foreign Service, and it is not fair to put more taxes on those at home who do not traveling.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not see any more reason for that than for asking them to contribute directly to the building of other Government structures.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is not only those traveling abroad, but big business firms sending their men over there. They acquire great wealth by reason of their representatives traveling throughout the world. While the fee is only \$10, we are providing for renewals, so that they get a passport for six years for only \$14.

Mr. CRAMTON. What is the present limit?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Two years.

Mr. CRAMTON. Now, as to the big business men who send their traveling men abroad, in this bill you will extend the renewals from two years to six years. The average traveler does not profit by this extension period, but you are urging that we keep the fee up to \$10 for them in order that we may build embassies abroad. I am asking you that you give the general public the same consideration as you are giving big business in reduced cost of passports.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Many persons go abroad every year. Some certainly go abroad as often as five or six times in the six years. They should be satisfied with a reduction from the present cost to them from \$30 to \$14 for the six years.

I am very strong on the teacher question. They go over there and bring something home. They enlarge their knowledge, they impart it to their pupils, and they should not be charged more than \$5.

Mr. CRAMTON. Do you make a distinction between teachers and the students—the students who have no income but who are preparing to teach?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have no objection to including students, but the student goes over there for information for himself or herself, whereas the teacher goes over there to qualify himself or herself for better work.

Mr. CRAMTON. The student is preparing to be a teacher, and as yet he has no income. The doctor who is preparing to be a physician needs contact with foreign hospitals. I think it is but fair to put them all on the same basis.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It would be a tremendous loss to the Government to put them on the \$5 basis.

Certainly the cost of the Foreign Service should not rest so entirely on those at home when it is the traveler who gets the great benefit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not true that with the average person who goes abroad the payment of this additional \$5 will be an infinitesimally small part of the expense and amount to a very little bit, but yet in the aggregate it will mean a great loss to the Treasury and the support of the State Department?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Of course, that is true. The argument has been made on this floor many times that the State Department should pay its own way. I do not agree with that, but certainly those using the service should be willing to contribute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield.

Mr. ARENTZ. Does the gentleman from Maryland believe that a department of our Government, a bureau of our Government, should be a profit-making department? Personally I look upon these departments of Government as a place where a citizen of the United States can go and have something done, through the appropriations that are made to sustain those departments, rather than to take out of their pockets additional money. Personally I do not think that there should be any profit made in the State Department.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know about profit. I am not talking about profit. I am talking about bearing a part of the expense of the service. If you drop a letter in the mail box, you pay 2 cents for the stamp. That is for service. The money received here is expended, and some five millions more, to give these men the very best service that the United States knows how to give. It is service and not profit.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I was impressed very much by what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] said. When Morgan goes abroad, as Amos 'n' Andy would say, "to arrange a big business proposition," I would not care if he paid a hundred dollars, but the only way to reach these students and ministers of the gospel and others who travel once in a lifetime is by this amendment. I think it should be left at \$5, and for that reason I would like to see the amendment prevail.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but inasmuch as I took the same position in the hearing on this bill which is now taken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], I am inclined to support his proposal to make a straight passport charge of \$5, and in doing that avoid the possibility of the proviso being stricken out which confers a special favor on teachers.

It is stated in the hearings that ordinary tourists as well as commercial tourists not only pay a passport charge of \$10, but pay in addition on this side an embarkation charge of \$5, and on the other side pay an embarkation charge of \$5, and, of course, pay all visa charges. When the items are totaled there is a fairly heavy exaction from a person of small means who is traveling abroad. Of course, we know that if the amount is fixed at \$5 instead of \$10 for the passport there will be some reduction of revenue, but in that connection there must be considered the rather extraordinary financial situation of the State Department.

The Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Carr, said before the committee:

The State Department, for operating expenses as distinct from those which are general charges against the Government, things that are carried under the State Department, but are really not chargeable to the State Department, the payment of our treaty obligations for the Panama Canal and things of that kind—omitting those things, the total net cost, according to the 1931 appropriation would be only \$5,600,000 to be taken out of the Treasury over and above the amount which the Government receives.

Then I asked him this question:

How much of that \$5,600,000 is represented by these passport charges?

He said "\$2,087,790."

So he shows that we are requiring Americans who travel abroad to pay the expenses of the State Department to the extent of over \$2,000,000. I can not see any good reason why that should be done any more than that people who have business with the Department of Justice or the Department of Commerce or any other department should be called upon to bear the expense of conducting the operations of any one of those departments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Answering the observation just made by the gentleman, is not this true, that a large portion of the time of the employees of the Department of State and its foreign representatives is spent in handling the affairs of American citizens abroad, and is it not true that they are the beneficiaries of the services of the employees of the State Department and therefore it is proper that they should pay whatever portion of that service is right?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. They may get some direct service that the general public, which does not travel, receives, but the Government of the United States and the entire Nation receive the benefit of the contacts of our people with foreign people. I can not see that there is any logic at all in calling upon the American traveler to take care of the State Department, especially in such a large measure as is the case now.

Mr. PATTERSON. If the gentleman will permit, the Department of Agriculture is rendering a splendid service to the farmers, yet the farmers are not required to pay for that service.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Possibly less than 1 per cent of our people go abroad. As I understand the gentleman, that less than 1 per cent are paying over 40 per cent of the cost of maintaining our foreign service.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is what it amounts to, and I do not think there is any justification for that. I believe we would be doing the country a real service by cutting down this passport charge, as proposed by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am in favor of any fee that will be uniform. I think a discrimination in favor of or against any one class is wrong. What I would like to ask the gentleman is this: The gentleman approves of the proposition to reduce the fee from \$10 to \$5. How is it the committee did not give that phase of the question consideration in committee?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. There was a good deal said about it, I will say to the gentleman from New York, but the majority of the committee were in favor of the bill as reported, and it is here for your consideration. What I am trying to do now, for one thing, I may say to the gentleman, is by supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan to save us from the possible adoption of the suggestion offered by the gentleman from New York which involves the teachers. I happen to be the author of the existing law, which does at this time create some discrimination in favor of teachers. I think the teachers are entitled to special consideration; my friend disagrees with me as to that; but if the Cramton amendment should be adopted, cutting the passport charge to \$5, we would have no further discussion of any discrimination of any character.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman will agree that students would also be entitled to the same consideration?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I say that if the Cramton amendment is adopted I have no further issue with my friend from New York.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan and retain the renewal charge of \$2, then we reduce the whole cost for six years to \$9, whereas at the present time it is \$10 for two years, except as to teachers.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The only change which the gentleman from Michigan proposes is to reduce the original charge from \$10 to \$5.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But the renewals would come along at \$2, so you will get a passport for six years for \$9, if you wanted

it that long, whereas now it costs \$30 for six years, except as to teachers. Does not the gentleman think that is a tremendous reduction?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. There would be a considerable change in the revenue situation if the gentleman's amendment is adopted; but I am not afraid of his amendment. He happens to be one of the most powerful members of the Committee on Appropriations. When he advocates a reduction in passport charges, that will mean a reduction in the revenue of the Government, that diminishes any hesitation I might otherwise have in supporting his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman was asked whether the committee considered the question of reducing the passport fee to \$5. That was considered, was it not, and did not the hearings show that there was no great demand for a cutting down of the passport fee, but the complaint they made and what they desired was merely to reduce the renewals?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is true. I will remind my friend, however, that the people before our committee were the representatives of the great commercial concerns and some small commercial concerns, and they were not troubled about the payment of the \$10. But I am thinking about the people aside from that group, the average traveler—and there are many thousands of them in this country—to whom \$10 is something important, and particularly so when added to the embarkation fees and visa charges.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman made the same argument before the committee that he is now making?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Exactly.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Is it not true that the bill now before the House is predicated on the very fact that you have a \$10 fee for a passport, and that is why you provide three renewals at \$2 each? Now, if you reverse yourselves on that and you cut it to \$5, there is no necessity for three renewals at \$2 each, as I understand it. Because the fee was burdensome and because it was somewhat high at \$10, the committee proposes to reduce that fee to \$5 and give three renewals at \$2 each. That is your whole scheme and that is your picture. You propose to reduce the original fee from \$10 to \$5 and provide for three renewals at \$2 each.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman is now suggesting another point not covered by what is proposed in the Cramton amendment.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I say that in providing for renewals you did that on the basis of a \$10 fee, and I think you have a pretty good bill if we vote down the last committee amendment, which creates a discrimination.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The report from the department emphasizes that the bill eliminates the discrimination now existing in favor of teachers.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I pointed that out. Then they put in the proviso.

Mr. CRAMTON. The bill was reported with the desire to eliminate discrimination.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Exactly; I pointed that out.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there is an amendment to the amendment pending and all recognition must be by unanimous consent. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill if amended as proposed and enacted will reduce passport fees from \$10 to \$5. This will mean a loss of revenue to the State Department of approximately \$1,000,000. This loss will have to be made up from taxes collected by the Government from the American people. Reduced to its lowest terms, this bill proposes to relieve American tourists, traveling abroad, of fees amounting to \$1,000,000 which they are now contributing to the expense of our Government, and place that burden on the millions of American people who do not go abroad.

Under existing conditions I can not see the necessity for or the wisdom of this reduction. Ordinarily I favor all proposals that will reduce taxes, but in our tax-reduction plan we are not beginning at the right place. Under this bill each American traveling abroad will save \$5, or one-half of the cost of his passport, but the revenue the Government loses under this bill must be made up by higher taxes on the people in the United States who are too poor to go abroad.

As a vast majority of American tourists belong to the wealthy and many to the idle-rich class, this saving of \$5 means nothing to them. They are not only able to pay the \$10 fee, but they should not be relieved of that obligation, because the charge is not unreasonable, and \$5 to them means no more than one grain of wheat in a bushel.

The passport fee is an insignificant item in the cost of a European trip and there is no good reason why this wealthy group should be relieved of this fee, especially in view of the fact that millions of farmers are groaning under an almost unbearable burden of debt and taxation, and men and women in the humbler walks of life find it difficult to "make both ends meet" and are drifting dangerously close to the rock of insolvency. I admit that every year a large number of students and men and women of limited means visit Europe, but they constitute a comparatively small part of the great multitude of Americans who during each summer season visit the cities, lakes, and mountains of Europe in pursuit of pleasure, ease, and relaxation.

Of course these students would like to have this fee reduced, and I would favor such reduction if by so doing I could avoid increasing the tax burden of the people who do not go abroad. If a person is financially able to tour Europe, he or she is able to pay the \$10 passport fee, which is not an unreasonable charge, especially in view of the fact that much of the time of our ambassadors, ministers, consuls, and other representatives is consumed in entertaining and serving American tourists. The \$10 passport fee is an infinitesimal part of the expense of a European tour, especially when it must follow, as night follows day, that whatever reduction we make in these passport fees must be made up by increasing the tax burdens on some other group of people, or in withholding from other classes of our citizens a corresponding reduction in their tax burdens.

Americans traveling abroad spend approximately \$750,000,000 annually. The \$1,000,000 that tourists would save under the pending bill is an exceedingly small part of this expense. Until men and women in the humbler walks of life are relieved of some of the tax burdens under which they are now laboring, I think we are justified in maintaining the present charge to tourists for passports.

In this connection I desire to submit a few observations on another question which I think is of vital interest to the American people. It is generally understood that the Hoover administration contemplates an increase in postal rates, especially rates on first-class matter. It is claimed that the Post Office Department has been running behind and is not self-supporting, and that in order to make it self-supporting postage rates must be increased. I shall vigorously oppose this program.

The Post Office Department is the one branch of our Government in which all the people in the United States are vitally and immediately interested. The Postal Service touches practically every man, woman, and child in the United States. It serves every family, rich or poor, urban or suburban, in every nook and corner of our Nation. To the great mass of American people the Postal Service typifies and symbolizes the Government of the United States. It is the only governmental agency with which the great body of our citizenry come in contact. It is the only one of the executive departments that renders anything like a service comparable with its cost.

The Post Office Department was created to serve the American people. It was not organized as a money-making proposition. For every dollar it costs, the American people receive 100 cents worth of service. It is undeniably the most efficient and serviceable of our executive departments. The Government disburses no money for which it gets greater returns than the money we appropriate to maintain our Postal Service in its present state of efficiency. For the money Uncle Sam invests in the other executive departments we get, relatively, inconsequential returns. The American people can better afford to give up two or three of the other executive departments rather than reduce the efficiency of the Postal Service.

From the creation of the Post Office Department, all things considered, it has been the best managed major activity of the Federal Government, and its operation has been at all times economical, efficient, businesslike, and practically free from scandal. Many other departments have developed extravagances, frauds, corruption, and scandals that have shocked the conscience of the Nation; but with the exception of the star-

route frauds in the post-Civil War period, the operation of the Postal Service has been free from scandal and less partisan than the administration of the other departments, bureaus, and commissions.

In my humble opinion, it is unwise to deal niggardly with this branch of service. If we are to cut and trim our expenditures, reason and common sense persuasively suggest that we should begin our economies in some of the other executive agencies of the Government.

There is no more reason why we should insist on making the Post Office Department self-sustaining than there is in insisting on legislation that will make the Interior Department, the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, the Department of Justice, or any of the other departments self-sustaining. No one will contend that we should make these other departments self-sustaining, although their activities in only a slight degree touch and serve the great mass of American people. While these other departments render efficient and necessary service, it is not nearly so important to each and every individual citizen as the service he receives from the Post Office Department.

The American people are not complaining because the Post Office Department spends a little more money than it collects from the public. Everybody knows that the people receive full value for such expenditure. In 1928 the Post Office Department collected from the American people \$693,633,921, gross revenue, and the service it rendered the American people involved an expenditure of \$725,699,766. That is to say, there was a deficit in 1928 of \$32,000,000. But the people did not complain, for the reason that the service furnished by the Post Office Department was businesslike, efficient, entirely satisfactory, and worth more than it cost them. The deficit in 1929 was larger, but even so, for every 100 cents the Postal Service cost the American people in 1929 they received \$1 worth of service.

The Postal Service is the most valuable activity in the business, social, civic, and economic life of the Nation. There is no yardstick by which the value of this service can be measured. On first-class mail in 1929, the Government revenues amounted to \$365,470,919.08, while it only cost the Government \$236,837,500.61 to handle this class of mail, including air mail. In other words, in 1929 the Government made a profit of more than \$78,000,000 in handling first-class mail. Whatever deficit there has been in the operation of the Post Office Department has not come from handling first-class mail, and there is absolutely no justification or excuse in raising the present 2-cent rate on letters.

I am more concerned in continuing the present system by which the Postal Service is efficiently managed, than I am in making the department self-sustaining, or in reducing the passport fees charged American tourists who are financially able to make Europe their summer playground. I have referred to these postal matters because I want this House and the country to know that there is no occasion or excuse for increasing postal rates, even though the department may not be self-supporting.

Those who argue that the Post Office Department must be self-supporting are being unconsciously deceived by a false philosophy which blinds them to the fundamental purpose which underlies our postal system. It was never contemplated that this useful agency of the Government must be self-supporting, and in this age of mammon we must not lose sight of the proposition that the Post Office Department is not a private business institution, the income of which must equal its expenditures, but it is a great governmental agency created and maintained to serve not a few but all the people of our beloved Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am in favor of the Cramton amendment because nothing better is offered to express my viewpoint.

If travel promotes good will, it is fundamentally illogical to tax that good will and that instrumentality. It is wrong to impose a burden upon the relatively poor people who desire to devote some part of their lifetime to travel. The rich man does not care. The relatively poor man has to care. I know this by personal experience. The ambition that throbbed in my bosom from my earliest days was to travel over Europe and view the art galleries of continental Europe. It was a worthy and honorable ambition, but money meant a great deal to me in my youth. I suppose it means something to me to-day. I had to count the dollars and save them for a long time in order to make a trip to Europe.

There are thousands and thousands of school-teachers who are struggling to keep up appearances and make both ends meet. There are thousands and thousands of very desirable people among our countrymen who are not too well off in this world's goods. They have the right to gratify their ambition to enjoy and see the finer things of life by traveling in Europe and promoting that good will which is essential to us, as it is essential to all peoples on the face of this earth.

Again, it promotes the welfare of our organization known as the United States Shipping Board. This will encourage travel, and travel is a mighty good thing for the nations and for the people that compose them. I believe there is an inscription on the façade of the Union Station here:

He that would bring home the wealth of the Indies must carry the wealth of the Indies with him.

So, too, in traveling he that would bring home knowledge must carry knowledge with him.

Let us encourage our people to go abroad after they have seen their own country, even though they have not great means. Let them come back after having established contacts there. They will be richer in experience, and the country to which they go will be better off for having seen desirable Americans, not with great money but with culture and refinement.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] is a good amendment. My only hope was that it would have gone a little further and made the cost smaller.

I repeat in closing what I started with—it is fundamentally illogical and we ought not to tax travel, which stimulates good will and promotes the welfare of our country.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of Members to the fact that we have two amendments up for your consideration, one by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] striking out the discrimination in behalf of the school-teachers, and one by the gentleman from Michigan reducing the passport fee from \$10 to \$5. The proposed reduction in the cost of obtaining an American passport raises an issue of policy. I am frank to say that, as far as I am concerned, I do not care what action the House takes on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. I think, however, the Members of the House should know that they are voting on a question of policy. It is not only in their power to determine what that policy should be for the future, but eminently right because the House initiates revenue legislation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. In order that I may emphasize what the gentleman is saying I want to read to him what Mr. Carr, Assistant Secretary of State, said before the committee:

As far as the State Department is concerned, this question of what shall be charged for a passport, whether anything shall be charged for a passport, or whether the fee is to be \$2, \$5, \$10, or \$20, the State Department does not presume to pass upon that question. That is a question wholly to be determined by Congress. Congress has determined it in the past. It has determined it without any recommendation from the Department of State, and the Department of State has no recommendation now on that particular subject.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is quoting the attitude of the State Department. This is the business of the House. The gentleman from Michigan is a member of the Committee on Appropriations and he assured us by implication that if his amendment prevails that the Appropriations Committee in the future will make up the deficit in the State Department appropriation bill.

The amendment proposed by him reduces the passport fee from \$10 to \$5, and will cost the Government a million dollars. It will make the State Department in the future non-self-supporting. The question is one of policy. Is there any reason why the State Department should be self-supporting as it has been in the past? We must realize that this amendment, if it prevails, will cost the Government \$1,000,000, and change the policy of having a self-supporting Diplomatic Service, but at the same time a reduction of passport fees will be popular with the traveling public.

As far as I am concerned—I am not speaking for the committee but individually—I do not care what action the House takes as long as the House knows what it is voting for. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LINTHICUM) there were 25 ayes and 23 noes.

The Chair announced the vote, and that the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Mr. CRAMTON. The request comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not enforce strictly the rule as to time, for the Chair realizes that the gentleman asked for tellers as rapidly as he could.

The question on ordering tellers was taken, and the Chair announced that 13 Members had arisen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, several of us did not understand that the Chair was taking a vote on tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question was on the committee amendment as amended, offered by the gentleman from Michigan, and upon that the ayes were 25 and the noes were 23. Thereupon, the gentleman from Maryland asked for tellers and only 13 Members arose.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But we did not understand that the Chair was putting the vote on tellers. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair be allowed to put the question of having tellers again.

Mr. ARENTZ. I move that the Chair put the question again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will again put the question on ordering tellers.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I object.

Mr. FISH. I ask the gentleman from Louisiana not to object, because there was a misunderstanding.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Very well, I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection. As many as are in favor of ordering tellers will rise. [After counting.] Twenty-six Members have arisen, a sufficient number, and tellers are ordered.

The Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CRAMTON and Mr. LINTHICUM.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 44 ayes and 33 noes.

So the amendment of Mr. CRAMTON was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10826 and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote upon the Cramton amendment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Speaker to the record upon that amendment.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is the second committee amendment as amended.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, I state to the Speaker that the so-called Cramton amendment was an amendment to the second committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. Therefore a separate vote can not be had upon the Cramton amendment.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But a separate vote can be had upon the second committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote upon the second committee amendment as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the other amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. A separate vote is demanded by the gentleman from Maryland on the second committee amendment as amended. The Clerk will report the committee amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "issue," insert "And provided further, That the charge for the issue of an original passport shall be \$5."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LINTHICUM) there were—ayes 49, noes 34.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present, and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 169, noes 89, not voting 169, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—169

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Ackerman | Culkin | Howard | Quin |
| Adkins | Cullen | Huddleston | Ramey, Frank M. |
| Allen | Dallinger | Irwin | Reed, N. Y. |
| Almon | Darrow | Johnson, Nebr. | Rowbottom |
| Andresen | DeRouen | Johnson, S. Dak. | Schneider |
| Arentz | Doughton | Kading | Sears |
| Ayres | Dowell | Kemp | Shaffer, Va. |
| Bacharach | Dunbar | Kinzer | Simmons |
| Bacon | Eaton, Colo. | Korell | Simms |
| Barbour | Eaton, N. J. | Kvale | Sinclair |
| Beers | Elliott | LaGuardia | Sloan |
| Bell | Englebright | Lampert | Smith, W. Va. |
| Black | Evans, Calif. | Langley | Snow |
| Bloom | Evans, Mont. | Lea | Speaks |
| Bohn | Fenn | Leavitt | Sproul, Kans. |
| Bowman | Fisher | Lehlbach | Stalker |
| Boylan | Fitzgerald | Letts | Stone |
| Brand, Ga. | Foss | Luce | Strong, Kans. |
| Brand, Ohio | Garber, Okla. | Ludlow | Strong, Pa. |
| Brigham | Gibson | McFadden | Swanson |
| Butler | Glover | McLaughlin | Swick |
| Cable | Granfield | McLeod | Swing |
| Campbell, Iowa | Gregory | McSwain | Thatcher |
| Campbell, Pa. | Guy | Magrady | Thompson |
| Carter, Calif. | Hadley | Manlove | Thurston |
| Carter, Wyo. | Hale | Mansfield | Timberlake |
| Chalmers | Hall, Ill. | Mapes | Tinkham |
| Chindblom | Hall, Ind. | Merritt | Vestal |
| Christgau | Hall, Miss. | Michaelson | Vinson, Ga. |
| Christopherson | Hall, N. Dak. | Michener | Wainwright |
| Clancy | Halsey | Miller | Walker |
| Clark, Md. | Hardy | Montague | Welch, Calif. |
| Cochran, Mo. | Hartley | Montet | Whitley |
| Cole | Haugen | Moore, Va. | Whittington |
| Collier | Hawley | Nelson, Me. | Wigglesworth |
| Colton | Hess | O'Connell | Wingo |
| Connolly | Hickey | O'Connor, La. | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Corning | Hoffman | Parker | Woodruff |
| Cox | Hogg | Patterson | Wyant |
| Coyle | Holaday | Pittenger | Yates |
| Cramton | Hope | Prall | |
| Crisp | Hopkins | Pratt, Harcourt J | |
| Crosser | | Purnell | |

NAYS—89

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Allgood | Estep | Lankford, Va. | Rogers |
| Bachmann | French | Linthicum | Romjue |
| Baird | Fuller | Lozier | Rutherford |
| Blackburn | Garner | McClintic, Okla. | Sanders, N. Y. |
| Bland | Garrett | McDuffie | Sanders, Tex. |
| Box | Green | McMillan | Sandlin |
| Briggs | Hammer | McReynolds | Schafer, Wis. |
| Browne | Hare | Menges | Shott, W. Va. |
| Browning | Hastings | Moore, Ky. | Sparks |
| Busby | Hill, Ala. | Morehead | Stegall |
| Byrns | Hill, Wash. | Nelson, Mo. | Summers, Wash. |
| Canfield | Hull, Morton D. | Nelson, Wis. | Summers, Tex. |
| Clark, N. C. | Hull, Wis. | O'Connor, Okla. | Taber |
| Cooper, Tenn. | Jeffers | Oldfield | Tarver |
| Cooper, Wis. | Johnson, Okla. | Oliver, Ala. | Warren |
| Craik | Johnson, Tex. | Palmer | Wason |
| Cross | Jones, Tex. | Parks | Williams |
| Davis | Kendall, Ky. | Patman | Williamson |
| Denison | Kiefner | Ragon | Wilson |
| Dominick | Kincheloe | Ramsayer | Woodrum |
| Doxey | Lambertson | Ramspeck | |
| Driver | Lanham | Rankin | |
| Edwards | Lankford, Ga. | | |

NOT VOTING—169

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Abernethy | Collins | Frear | Jenkins |
| Aldrich | Connery | Free | Johnson, Ill. |
| Andrew | Cooke | Freeman | Johnson, Ind. |
| Arnold | Cooper, Ohio | Fulmer | Johnson, Wash. |
| Aswell | Craddock | Gambrell | Johnston, Mo. |
| Auf der Heide | Crowther | Garber, Va. | Jonas, N. C. |
| Bankhead | Curry | Gasque | Kahn |
| Beck | Davenport | Gavagan | Kearns |
| Beedy | Dempsey | Gifford | Kelly |
| Bolton | De Priest | Golder | Kendall, Pa. |
| Britten | Dickinson | Goldsborough | Kennedy |
| Brumm | Dickstein | Goodwin | Kerr |
| Brunner | Douglas, Ariz. | Graham | Ketcham |
| Buchanan | Douglass, Mass. | Greenwood | Kiess |
| Buckbee | Doutrich | Griffin | Knutson |
| Burdick | Doyle | Hancock | Kopp |
| Burtness | Drane | Hoch | Kunz |
| Cannon | Drewry | Hooper | Kurtz |
| Carley | Dyer | Houston, Del. | Larsen |
| Cartwright | Ellis | Hudson | Leech |
| Celler | Eslick | Hudspeth | Lindsay |
| Chase | Esterly | Hull, Tenn. | McClintock, Ohio |
| Clague | Finley | Hull, William E. | McCormack, Mass. |
| Clarke, N. Y. | Fitzpatrick | Igoe | McCormick, Ill. |
| Cochran, Pa. | Fort | James | McKeown |

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Maas | Porter | Smith, Idaho | Underhill |
| Martin | Pou | Snell | Underwood |
| Mead | Pratt, Ruth | Somers, N. Y. | Vincent, Mich. |
| Mooney | Pritchard | Spearing | Watres |
| Moore, Ohio | Quayle | Sproul, Ill. | Watson |
| Morgan | Rainey, Henry T. | Stedman | Welsh, Pa. |
| Mouser | Ransley | Stevenson | White |
| Murphy | Rayburn | Stobbs | Whitehead |
| Newhall | Reece | Sullivan, N. Y. | Wolfenden |
| Niedringhaus | Reid, Ill. | Stafford | Wolverton, W. Va. |
| Nolan | Robinson | Sullivan, Pa. | Wood |
| Norton | Sabath | Taylor, Colo. | Wright |
| O'Connor, N. Y. | Seger | Taylor, Tenn. | Wurzbach |
| Oliver, N. Y. | Seiberling | Temple | Yon |
| Owen | Selvig | Tilson | Zihlman |
| Palmisano | Short, Mo. | Treadway | |
| Peavey | Shreve | Tucker | |
| Perkins | Sirovich | Turpin | |

So the amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:
General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Snell with Mr. Bankhead.
Mr. Tilson with Mr. Mead.
Mr. Freeman with Mr. Fulmer.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Mooney.
Mr. Watson with Mrs. Owen.
Mr. Buckbee with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Porter with Mr. Stedman.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Cochran of Pennsylvania with Mr. Aswell.
Mr. Cooper of Ohio with Mr. Connery.
Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania with Mr. Quayle.
Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Drane.
Mr. Seger with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Doutrich with Mr. Cannon.
Mr. Treadway with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Mass with Mr. Henry T. Rainey.
Mr. Ketcham with Mr. Eslick.
Mr. Davenport with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. Crowther with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. Robinson with Mr. Yon.
Mr. Temple with Mr. Brunner.
Mr. Kopp with Mr. Rayburn.
Mr. Fort with Mr. Larsen.
Mr. Golder with Mr. Carley.
Mr. Mouser with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Dyer with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Free with Mr. Oliver of New York.
Mr. Martin with Mr. Pou.
Mr. Shreve with Mr. Arnold.
Mr. Ransley with Mr. McKeown.
Mr. Hudson with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Douglas of Arizona.
Mr. Niedringhaus with Mr. Gambrill.
Mr. Beedy with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Hooper with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.
Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Tucker.
Mr. Beck with Mr. Gavagan.
Mr. Short with Mr. Spearing.
Mr. Sproul of Illinois with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Kiess with Mr. Collins.
Mr. McClintock of Ohio with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Taylor of Tennessee with Mr. Auf der Heide.
Mr. Stafford with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Kendall of Pennsylvania with Mr. McCormack of Massachusetts.
Mr. Smith of Idaho with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
Mr. Johnston of Missouri with Mr. Igoe.
Mr. Reece with Mr. Greenwood.
Mr. Jenkins with Mr. Whitehead.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Gasque.
Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Sullivan of New York.
Mr. Bolton with Mr. Underwood.
Mr. Clague with Mr. Fitzpatrick.
Mr. Britten with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Hudspeth.
Mr. Esterly with Mr. Sirovich.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill, striking out the word "six," in line 7, page 2, and substituting the word "four."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves to recommit the bill. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PATTERSON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instruction to report the same back forthwith, striking out the word "six," in line 7, on page 2, and substituting the word "four."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. FISH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12236) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12236, the naval appropriation bill, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12236) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. FRENCH, Mr. HARDY, Mr. TABER, Mr. AYRES, and Mr. OLIVER of Alabama.

BILLS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules for printing in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 232

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the Committee on the Judiciary shall have Tuesday, June 3, for the consideration under the general rules of the House of the following bills: H. R. 12056, H. R. 10341, H. R. 9937, H. R. 9985, H. R. 6806, H. R. 9601, and H. R. 2903.

This rule not to interfere with privileged business.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

OMNIBUS BRIDGE BILL

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill H. R. 9806 for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9806) to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States.

RETIREMENT BILL—WORK OF ROBERT H. ALCORN

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the retirement bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, the signing by the President of the Dale-Lehlbach retirement bill marks the culmination of years of ceaseless striving on the part of civil-service employees for an adequate retirement measure.

The uncoordinated efforts of separate organizations brought meager results through many years of effort. It was not until the formation of the Joint Conference on Retirement that real progress was made in bringing forth a measure that would ease the declining days of the worn-out employees of the Government.

The Joint Conference on Retirement was formed in 1917, and Robert H. Alcorn, who had served for several years as the chairman of the retirement committee of the Naval Gun Factory, was elected chairman and has held the position to this time.

It is not my purpose to dwell on the struggles of the last 13 years to secure the enactment of the McKellar-Keating bill, the Dale-Wadsworth bill, or the Sterling-Lehlbach bill which became a law in 1920, but I do wish to pay a tribute to the sterling character, the ability, and the tenacity of the chairman who through all the trying situations of the many years has retained the respect and confidence of the great body of Government workers. He has kept the ranks closed with only one single exception.

The joint conference consists of representatives of the navy yards, naval stations and arsenals, National Association of Letter Carriers, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Railway Mail Clerks, National Association of Master Mechanics, District No. 44 of Machinists, Government printers, printing pressmen, bookbinders, mechanical trades of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and, in addition, through their confidence in the chairman, nearly all of the independent organizations in the Govern-

ment service in the District of Columbia and throughout the country have loyally cooperated.

I think it is a conservative estimate that there are in excess of 300,000 men and women enrolled under the banner or affiliated with the Joint Conference on Retirement. By reason of diversity of occupations and environment conflicting demands have inevitably arisen among the different groups, but all these differences have been amicably adjusted and all have carried on with singleness of purpose that brought results. Much of the success has been due to the tireless efforts of Chairman Robert H. Alcorn.

You all know him. There are few whose offices he has not visited and been received with a welcome. Courteous and kindly, he has always found the door open to him, and upon his departure, always an invitation to return. He has had the confidence of the members of the Civil Service Committees. The glory of success with the retirement measure belongs to him. I congratulate the thousands of loyal Government workers that they have been led by such a splendid type of man.

He has made a genuine sacrifice. In 1921 he was reduced in his grade owing to loss of time due to work for his organization. He was reinstated in 1927, but remained less than a year in the service. He gave up his position that he might have the time to work for others. He is therefore ineligible to share in the benefits of retirement. He has kept the faith, he has won the fight, but can not share in the realization of his dream.

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS AND THE TARIFF

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the tariff.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of misinformation or lack of information apparent in the discussions of the pending tariff bill and its effects upon agriculture. No one can say accurately what the costs and benefits will be when the bill goes into effect, but a reasonable estimate can be given provided the economic conditions remain stable. Just at present, and for the past eight months, there has been grave economic unrest in the United States. This same condition prevails throughout the world, and is particularly acute in parts of Europe, South America and Australia. These countries are not buying as freely of our exports as last year, and at the same time are underselling us in the markets of the world on many agricultural products. Not only is this competition felt in world markets but our home markets are greatly depressed thereby. Such products of the North Dakota farmer as beef, flax, and wool have especially suffered from this competition as the large imports of these articles into the United States amply testify.

FRAMING OF TARIFF BILL

When President Hoover was elected he announced that he would call a special session of Congress, one of the purposes being to revise the tariff in the interests of agriculture and the other to enact a farm marketing bill. This latter object was accomplished in the special session in the spring of 1929 through the passage of the law creating the Federal Farm Board, and marked the culmination of the long fight waged by the friends of agriculture for legislation to aid in restoring that industry to a paying basis. As a pioneer in that struggle, I introduced my first bill for farm relief almost 10 years ago. This was soon followed by the Norris-Sinclair marketing bill, the first of the export marketing corporation bills, embodying the principles later adopted in the McNary-Haugen bill. During all of this time I have taken an active part for the passage of a measure to help farmers to get a fair price for their products. I have, therefore, been deeply interested in doing my part toward carrying out the program of the President for the revision of the tariff for the benefit of agriculture.

All tariff legislation is framed by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House. While I am not a member of that committee, I appeared before it with other Representatives from the Northwest to urge the adoption of rates favorable to our products. In preparation of a bill to present to the House the committee held extensive hearings daily from January 7, 1929, to February 27, 1929. At these hearings persons from all over the United States appeared and offered their views. In addition to Members of Congress there were representatives of the Farmers' Union, the North Dakota Agricultural College, and many farm organizations. At the conclusion of the hearings the committee went into executive session, and on May 9, 1929, reported what is known as the Hawley tariff bill to the House, the measure taking the name of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The bill was passed by the House on May 28, 1929, and was sent to the Senate.

It has been said, and particularly by members of the minority party in this House, that the bill was passed under gag rule and that Representatives by their votes to limit debate put themselves in position where they could not offer an amendment which would be beneficial to the farmers of this country. Let us see what the facts are. We find that every tariff bill enacted since 1874, whether Republican or Democratic, has been considered under the same kind of a rule, and must be. This is clearly understood when we remember that there are 435 Members of the House, and that the tariff bill contained some 20,000 items. Unless debate were limited a tariff bill would be before the House for several years without enactment, and inasmuch as there is a change in membership in this body every two years, it will be readily seen that the Congress would expire and no law be passed. The Senate, with its membership of 96 and more liberal rules for debate, discussed the tariff continuously from September 4, 1929, to March 24, 1930. Even then it was necessary to set definite dates for closing of debate on the various schedules. This disposes of the charge of gag rule. If we were to have a tariff law enacted it had to be first passed by the House, and this was done in the usual and orderly way. It is also appropriate to point out that some 130 amendments were added to the bill on the floor of the House, including an increase in flax from 56 cents to 63 cents a bushel.

I voted for the tariff bill when it was before the House because it carried the increased rates on agricultural products written in upon recommendations of the Farmers' Union, agricultural college economists, farmers' organizations generally, and Members of Congress from the Northwest farming States, and also because it is the first time in the history of tariff legislation that an attempt has been made to give agriculture adequate protection and equality with industry.

A FEW OF THE INCREASES WHICH WILL BENEFIT NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS

Some of the increases which the bill carried as it passed the House, and which I feel will be of substantial benefit to farmers, are: 2 and 2½ cents a pound on live cattle; 2½ cents a pound on milk; 14 cents a pound on butter; 75 cents per hundred-weight on potatoes; 2 cents a pound on onions; 6 cents a pound on clover seed; 10 per cent ad valorem on hides; alfalfa seed, 5 cents per pound; live poultry, 6 cents, and dressed poultry, 8 cents per pound; eggs, 8 cents per pound. Wool was increased to carry a duty of 34 cents per pound, and flaxseed 63 cents a bushel. Numerous other increases were included for agricultural products.

Briefly, we in North Dakota have to decide between the rates under the Fordney-McCumber tariff law, now in effect, or the less discriminatory rates of the Hawley bill. I am not claiming that the Hawley rates are all that agriculture should have, for they are not, but they are more favorable than the present law. The United States Tariff Commission has prepared a comparative table of the agricultural and industrial rates under the act of 1922 and under the pending bill. From this, we find that under existing law the average rate of protective tariff for agriculture is approximately 22 per cent, and for industry approximately 42 per cent. Under the proposed law, the rates are about 33 per cent for agriculture and about 43 per cent for industry. These figures place agriculture in a much more favorable position with industry than is possible under existing law. In other words, we will be 10 per cent nearer parity, although still 10 per cent below equality.

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS VERSUS FOREIGN IMPORTS

In addition I will say that the increases are particularly favorable to farmers of North Dakota. The United States last year imported about 24,000,000 bushels of flax, 4,000,000 bushels of potatoes, 13,000,000 pounds of clover and alfalfa seed, 4,000,000 gallons of milk, 76,000,000 pounds of cheese, two and one-half million pounds of butter, 7,000,000 pounds of poultry, 27,000,000 pounds of frozen and dried eggs, 3,000,000 pounds of mutton, 104,000,000 pounds of clean wool, 367,000,000 pounds of beef, and 30,000,000 pounds of pork and other meats. All of these articles could have been produced in the United States, and a good share of them in North Dakota. Why should the farmers of North Dakota be forced to meet this foreign competition at home in order to help manufacturers sell their products abroad? The proposed bill carries increases in tariff on every one of the above-mentioned articles, which will reflect benefits directly to our farmers. We need not worry about foreign markets for our automobiles. These manufacturers are eminently able to find a market for their output. What we should concern ourselves about is the home market for our own farm products. Why should we continue a policy which gives to farmers of other countries one and a half billion dollars of our home market annually? American farmers should be sufficiently protected to give them a market for every dollar's worth of crops that they can reasonably produce. Italy and France have long had a

tariff policy. In fact, there is no such thing as a free-trade country in the world. Each country fixes its tariffs to its own economic advantage.

My State is probably the greatest surplus-producing State of farm products per capita in the Union. Large amounts of grain, livestock, and other agricultural products are raised which must find a market beyond the boundaries of the home State, and sometimes even beyond the boundaries of the Nation. We originate annually about 250,000 carloads of farm products that enter into interstate commerce. The value of this vast production will be directly increased by the enactment of the pending tariff bill. In answer to the charge that farmers will not get much benefit from the tariff because they will have to pay more for the manufactured articles they have to buy it can be said, first, as mentioned above, that the total advance in the industrial schedules is only about 1 per cent as against almost 11 per cent for agriculture; second, that our consumption of industrial products in North Dakota is less than half the value of our agricultural products.

PROTEST AGAINST BILL FROM INDUSTRIAL CENTERS

Since it has become evident that industry is not to reap the same measure of benefit from the bill that agriculture will have, a loud hue and cry has been raised on behalf of these interests to "kill the bill." A recent poll of 590 editors in the 8 largest industrial States indicates that they are more than 2 to 1 against the enactment of the measure. Propaganda to the effect that the rates are unfair and discriminatory is being circulated, and the President is being urged to veto. As a matter of fact, the only discrimination or unfairness is that for the first time industry has failed to receive the lion's share of protective tariff, and, of course, is dissatisfied. This is being cleverly disguised with complaints that the bill will increase the cost of living, is a "robber tariff," and so forth. No such protests were made when the tariff act of 1922 was passed, which added enormously to already overburdened agriculture. The trouble is, to use a homely saying, "The shoe is now on the other foot," and is pinching industry a little. But farmers, and particularly North Dakota farmers, need not concern themselves over this. No aid and little sympathy was given them during the years of agricultural depression when they were hard pressed. If now, through the passage of farm aid and tariff legislation, they are coming, not into their own, but even in sight of it, I for one, shall rejoice and shall do my utmost for this and every other measure in their behalf.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I demand a division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 8, yeas 74.

So the motion was rejected.

CLAIM OF THE NORWEGIAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up House Joint Resolution 322.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) authorizing payment of the claim of the Norwegian Government for interest upon money advanced by it in connection with the protection of American interests in Russia.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 322, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 322, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay to the Government of Norway, as an act of grace and without reference to the question of legal liability, an amount equal to 6½ per cent interest upon 58,480 krone from February 24, 1920, to December 8, 1920, and upon 65,162.97 krone from December 8, 1920, to July 13, 1925, the sums advanced by the Government of

Norway in connection with the care by its representatives of American interests in Moscow, Russia, during the years 1918 and 1919, together with 6½ per cent interest on the unpaid interest from July 13, 1925, to the date of payment pursuant to this joint resolution, not to exceed, in all, \$8,500; and the appropriation for the "Relief, protection, and transportation of American citizens in Europe," made by the act approved April 17, 1917, is hereby made available for the payment of the claim aforesaid.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 322 authorizes the payment of \$8,500 in back interest to the Government of Norway for taking over and protecting American interests in Moscow, Russia, in September, 1918.

It comes to this House with a letter from the President of the United States requesting its passage, and also from the Secretary of State.

I hope there will not be any lengthy discussion of the pending resolution. I think we have delayed favorable action far too long. A similar bill passed the House a few years ago and became involved in the congestion in the Senate and failed to pass. It is simply a matter of taking care of a small amount of interest due the Norwegian Government. We are under great obligation to Norway for taking over and protecting the interests of our nationals and our property in Russia, and unless somebody wishes to be heard on the question, I will move that the committee arise.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Was there a request made by this Government of Norway to protect our interests?

Mr. FISH. Yes. A request was made by our Government, and their vice consul took over the job and represented us there.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does the Norwegian Government owe us anything? Have we any claims against the Norwegian Government?

Mr. FISH. Not that I know of. We requested them to take over our interests and look after them in Russia when we withdrew.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman expect to take up any more bills after this resolution?

Mr. FISH. I expect to.

The Clerk read the resolution for amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering why this provides for interest at the rate of 6½ per cent instead of the rate which the Government pays here?

Mr. FISH. That came in a request from the Department of State, and I believe, inasmuch as Norway acted at our request in this matter, we are under obligation to Norway, and we should not question whether it is 6 per cent or 7 per cent, or anything within reason, as the amount involved is too small to cause a controversy.

Mr. GREEN. Is that the prevailing rate in Norway?

Mr. FISH. I can not say. That request came from the State Department, and I believe it represents the prevailing rate of interest at the time of the indebtedness.

Mr. GREEN. Does not the gentleman think the rate should be reduced?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNELL. This is figured at the rate of exchange, according to the Secretary of State. It figures 6½ per cent. That is the difference between the krone and the dollar.

Mr. GREEN. I do not see how we can justify a rate higher than the banks in America charge, as well as the Government. It seems to me like 3 or 4 per cent would be a reasonable amount.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. HOWARD. I suggest to the gentleman that he offer to amend the bill by striking out "6½ per cent" and inserting "5 per cent," and the resolution will pass.

Mr. FISH. I am sorry to say I can not offer or accept such an amendment. I think we are under great obligation to Norway and should not haggle about the rate of interest. We owe a debt of gratitude to Norway for representing us in Russia, and we want to pay it in full.

Mr. HOWARD. I am in favor of paying the debt of gratitude and I am in favor of the resolution, but our Government pays only 5 per cent to its Indians for their funds. Why pay Norway 6½ per cent?

Mr. FISH. Simply because that was the prevailing rate during the war, at the time this money was advanced.

Mr. HOWARD. I am almost sorry that I am in favor of the resolution, or I would offer to amend it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest that the spelling of the word "kroner" is wrong in lines 7 and 8. It should be "kroner" instead of "krone" as it appears in the resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the superior knowledge of the Chair and accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the amendment correcting the spelling of the word "kroner"?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GREEN: Page 1, line 6, strike out "6½" and insert in lieu thereof "5."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I can not see how we can justify the payment of this rate of interest which is higher than is paid in the city of Washington by the banks.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATTERSON. I notice in line 3 the amount is limited to \$8,500. They can not go beyond that. The President says in his message it is an act of grace.

Mr. GREEN. I appreciate that and I am going to vote for the resolution, but I do not see how we can justify paying more interest than is paid by the banks in the city of Washington.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Perhaps the gentleman is under a misapprehension. Apparently this is to reimburse the Government of Norway for what they had to pay for the money which they advanced for certain purposes—that is, the relief of American citizens. That, no doubt, has already been adjusted, and this is simply to pay their interest charge, to reimburse them.

Mr. GREEN. Have they paid that amount?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I suppose that is the understanding. I do not suppose this is an arbitrary amount. This is to reimburse the cost to the Government of Norway which they had to pay at the time we asked them to advance this money.

Mr. GREEN. Were they required to pay 6½ per cent, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FISH. I believe so.

Mr. GREEN. Will they get any more than the amount which they have paid out?

Mr. FISH. My understanding is they will not, except for the additional interest.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I shall not use the time allowed me to-day to address you relative to some legislation that benefits a particular part of our country nor for an appropriation for some pet project in which some particular State or individual is concerned, but I am going to use the time allotted me in speaking to you about a matter that interests our common humanity.

Am I my brother's keeper?

Our answer to that is, "We are our brother's keeper."

For a period of 40 years Congress went merrily along pursuing the even tenor of its way, making many offenses felonies, and rapidly filling up the Federal penitentiaries of this country; while the Federal courts in their ceaseless grind in compliance with the provisions of these new statutes sentenced thousands of men and women throughout our country to the Federal prisons; and while their population increased by leaps and bounds, yet no thought or no effort was directed by Congress to provide adequate and decent housing for these prisoners.

Congress proceeded on the theory that the prisons by some inexplicable process would be made to expand so as to receive and house all the unfortunates committed to them. This overcrowding finally assumed the proportions of a national menace.

In the Seventieth Congress I introduced a resolution to investigate Federal penitentiaries and jails. It was adopted by

the House, and a special committee consisting of five members, JOHN G. COOPER, WILLIAM F. KOPP, JOHN TABER, THOMAS M. BELL, and JOHN J. BOYLAN, were appointed by the Speaker on this committee. The resolution instructed the committee to visit the Federal penitentiaries and jails, to hold hearings, and obtain all available information from dependable sources of Federal prison conditions in State, counties, and municipal prisons and jails; the care of such prisoners as to housing, food, health, recreation, work, discipline, classification, medical treatment, and other pertinent facts; the rates of compensation paid for maintenance and board of such prisoners, the services rendered for such compensation, and the beneficiaries of such compensation; and the need for additional Federal and penal and reformatory institutions to take care of the Federal prisoners. This special committee was further authorized and directed to make a survey of the employment of prisoners in the penal and reformatory institutions of the United States and of the several States.

In compliance with this resolution, this special committee visited the Federal penitentiaries located at Leavenworth, Kans.; Atlanta, Ga.; McNeil Island, Puget Sound, Wash. In these penitentiaries are confined most of the Federal prisoners sentenced for more than one year. The committee also visited the United States Industrial Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio, on the old Camp Sherman Military Reservation, and found that construction had been commenced. The Industrial Institution for Women at Alderson, W. Va., was found completed.

It was found that the average daily population of Federal prisons in the United States was nearly 19,000. It was also learned that for the past 10 years the prison population has increased approximately at an average of 10 per cent per year.

In addition to this population there was during the fiscal year of 1928 an average daily population of over 9,700 persons serving short sentences or awaiting trial in some 1,100 State, county, and city jails throughout the country. In addition to visiting the Federal penitentiaries and reformatories, the committee also visited several State prisons, including the Women's State Prison in Vermont, and State prisons at Comstock and Sing Sing, N. Y., and the Ohio State prison at Columbus.

CONGESTED CONDITIONS

It was found that a very acute condition confronted those who were administering the Federal penal system due to the lack of a proper program and to the increase in the number of persons arrested, convicted, and committed for violations of Federal penal laws, whereby the penitentiaries were overcrowded with those sentenced to prison for more than one year. It also observed in all the county and municipal jails the committee visited that there was overcrowding and idleness. The committee was also reliably informed that the same deplorable condition existed in many of the 1,100 local jails where short-term Federal prisoners were confined.

It was found that the Leavenworth Penitentiary had within its walls more than twice as many prisoners than it was able to accommodate. The capacity of the Atlanta Penitentiary is about 1,700, yet over 3,100 prisoners were confined in that institution. In both of these institutions there exists the vicious practice of "doubling up," or placing two prisoners in single cells. This was necessary on account of the congestion. Many were found sleeping in dark, ily ventilated basements and corridors; improvised dormitories were in use; the kitchen and mess facilities were overloaded to more than twice their proper capacity. It was found that these institutions had reached their absolute physical capacity, and that no additional prisoners could be "jammed" within their walls.

The committee also found that no more prisoners should be confined in the McNeil Island Penitentiary not only because it has reached its proper physical capacity but also because of the remoteness of its location in one corner of the country, far from the centers of commitments, and because of the impossibility of securing sufficient fresh water. Only at one Federal institution—the Women's Industrial Institution at Alderson, W. Va.—did the committee find sufficient and proper facilities for the prisoners committed to that institution.

EMPLOYMENT OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

Out of an average daily population of 3,200 for the year of 1928 at the Atlanta Penitentiary, aside from the inmates employed in the maintenance and operation of the prison, only 1,050 prisoners were actually employed in the factories or on the farm. The only industrial activity at Leavenworth Penitentiary consists of shops to manufacture shoes, brooms, and brushes for the Indian Service and certain other Government departments and for the inmates of the Federal penal institutions. At Leavenworth most of the prisoners were employed part time, but there was not enough work to keep the prisoners properly engaged during ordinary working hours.

CONDITIONS IN NONFEDERAL INSTITUTIONS

Persons convicted and held for violations of United States statutes are committed to the Federal penitentiaries, and are also sent to county and municipal jails, workhouses, and lock-ups. In many of the non-Federal institutions, especially county and city jails, the conditions are most deplorable. These jails are congested, and in most of them there is no provision for employing prisoners. In many of these places there is no separation of the guilty from the innocent; the sick from the well; the young from the old; and of the hardened criminals from first offenders. As these Federal prisoners were only boarders in these institutions and jails, the Federal prison authorities have been powerless to remedy the conditions affecting these prisoners and persons awaiting trial and detained as witnesses.

HEARINGS

Hearings were held in Washington and invitations were extended to leading penologists of the country to attend them. The names of those who took a prominent part at the hearings are as follows: Capt. A. H. Conner, superintendent of prisons, and his staff at Washington and at the institutions; Mr. Herbert D. Brown, Chief of the Bureau of Efficiency, and his organization, including Mr. J. D. Bennett, Dr. Amos W. Butler, and Joseph W. Sanford; Dr. Hastings H. Hart, consultant in delinquency and penology of the Russell Sage Foundation; and Maj. Sidney W. Brewster, assistant to the commissioner of corrections of New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Can the gentleman give us some idea as to how many are confined in State and Federal penitentiaries?

Mr. BOYLAN. The present daily population is about 19,000.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Administration of prison system.—First. The committee recommended that the office of the superintendent of prisons in the Department of Justice be made a major bureau in said department and that the superintendent of prisons be given an adequate organization to assist him.

Extension of the probation system.—Second. It was found that out of a total of 92 Federal judicial districts, only 6 employed probation officers. It was recommended that additional probation officers should be appointed as fast as they could be properly selected. It also recommended that the parole system should be altered and that Congress should enact a law establishing a parole board and giving it full authority to act on parole applications without requiring the approval of the Attorney General. It also urged the establishment of two institutions for the care of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming narcotic drugs as provided by the Porter bill.

Third. It further recommended the establishing of two new penitentiaries, one in the northeastern part of the United States and the other one to be located west of the Mississippi River.

Fourth. The committee also recommended that a bill be introduced to provide employment of Federal prisoners, for their training and schooling in trades and occupations.

Fifth. The committee also recommended the establishment of jails and workhouses for Federal prisoners at New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis, San Francisco, and such other places as the need from time to time shall require.

After a committee reports to the Congress, in many cases, the report is promptly pigeonholed and nothing further is done about the matters that have been investigated. However, on account of the distressingly bad conditions existing in the Federal penitentiaries coupled with the general unrest of inmates of prisons and penitentiaries throughout the country as evidenced by the uprising and riots in the prisons of Leavenworth, Kans.; New York, Ohio, and other States, the solution of the prison problem was put squarely up to the Congress and the legislatures of the various States.

The terrible catastrophe at Ohio State Penitentiary at Columbus, Ohio, that caused the death of 319 convicts and injured 250 others is the most recent exemplification of the distressing conditions that exist in not only that State but in practically every State of the Union, and likewise in the Federal penitentiaries. It is pretty generally held by leading penologists

and humanitarians of the country that the great outstanding cause of prison disorders, is the prisoners' loss of hope. The trend throughout the country of imposing long prison sentences, together with reduction in releases and paroles has resulted in increased congestion in almost every institution. The release of prisoners on parole before the expiration of their sentence on evidence of their disposition to lead upright lives has been a powerful stimulus to self-restraint.

The herding of many in cells that are illy ventilated, insanitary, without adequate plumbing; often swarming with vermin; with most of their time spent in idleness and with the insufficient and poorly balanced diet is probably the worst of prison evils. While men are serving their sentence every effort should be made to keep up their morale and keep alive and stimulate their self-respect; and to prepare them to take their places in the world when they go forth from prison. In order to do this we must first of all establish decent living conditions in the prisons.

The prison should not rob a man of self-respect. The men who live in prisons should leave prison with hope in their hearts. Now what has Congress done to bring about an improvement in the conditions that this special committee found existed in Federal penitentiaries?

I am going to say to you that instead of taking a long sleep on the matter and trying to continue to make "sardine boxes" out of the prisons, we have awakened to a full measure of the responsibility that is ours and have passed the following legislation which are now public laws:

A bill to establish a hospital for defective delinquents.

A bill to establish in the Department of Justice a Bureau of Prisons.

A bill to establish two new institutions for the confinement of United States prisoners. One in the northeastern part of the United States, and the other one to be located west of the Mississippi River.

A bill to appoint additional Federal probation officers.

A bill creating a single board of parole, to consist of three members, to take the place of all existing boards of parole at Federal prison institutions.

A bill to provide for the employment of Federal prisoners, for their training and schooling in trades and occupations.

All these laws carry out the recommendations made by the special committee in its report to the House.

I congratulate the Congress upon this record. It really shows an appreciation of this most important problem confronting us, and the prompt response to the recommendations of the committee is indicative of the attention and thought that has been given by the Members of both Houses to this most pressing matter.

It is well for us to have in mind that the unfortunate who is in the toils of the law needs our help, our sympathy, our counsel, and support, because our aim should be to make the prisoner of to-day the respected citizen of to-morrow.

If we do this, we can, indeed, say that we have assumed the responsibility of being our brother's keeper, and that we have discharged that duty to the best of our ability. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. J. Res. 322) authorizing payment of the claim of the Norwegian Government for interest upon money advanced by it in connection with the protection of American interests in Russia, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FISH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] may have until next Monday to file minority views on bills reported by the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] may have until Monday to file minority views on bills reported by the Judiciary Committee. Is there objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent to modify the order which permitted me to have until midnight to-night to file minority views. I would like to have until Monday next, because I want to confer with the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF HON. FRANKLIN W. FORT, OF NEW JERSEY

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein a speech delivered by Hon. FRANKLIN W. FORT in Newark last night upon prohibition.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address delivered by Congressman FRANKLIN W. FORT, of New Jersey, at initial rally of north Jersey supporters in East Orange High School, East Orange, N. J., May 28, 1930. The meeting was under the auspices of volunteer Fort workers of Essex County. Lincoln E. Rowley, city clerk of East Orange, was chairman. Speech and program were broadcast over station WOR.

Congressman FORT's speech is as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED AT INITIAL RALLY OF FORT WORKERS, ESSEX COUNTY, N. J.

Mr. Rowley, friends, and neighbors, may I thank you all for so many of you coming out here on this very bad night. I appreciate it from the bottom of my heart and appreciate the feeling of personal friendship and of loyalty to the cause which I represent.

I have a speech which I have prepared for this evening, but before delivering it I want to comment very briefly on another question. From many sources I hear that a speech on prohibition which I made last January in Congress is being misquoted and distorted by opposing speakers. I shall therefore make it the subject of my next speech over the radio, the date of which has not yet been fixed, but will be in the near future. In the meantime I trust that those who speak about it will first read it and in their comments on what they are pleased to call the light-wine and home-brew plea will include the fact that the speech referred to the making of those beverages if nonintoxicating in fact, and not otherwise. [Applause.]

The issue of this campaign is not of my making. Mr. Morrow devoted his entire first speech and statement of the campaign to it. Senator Frelinghuysen made it the subject of his most important public statement; and Mr. Kelly—of whom I know nothing, except that he is running as opposed to the eighteenth amendment—has no other issue. Neither of my chief opponents stands before the people of this State favoring any modification of the Volstead Act. Neither stands before the people of this State favoring what we have heard of in the past as light wines and beer. It is the first time, my friends, so far as my knowledge goes, that the question of whether the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution shall be retained or repealed has been the clear-cut and unmistakable issue in any State in the United States.

Now, then, with my opponents urging the repeal, the first query that is before us is whether the method of change from existing conditions which they advocate is a practicable method, and for the consideration of that we must dip back a little ways into history. Prior to the adoption of national prohibition 24 States of the Union had adopted state-wide prohibition by popular vote; 9 additional States had adopted prohibition by a vote of their legislatures. So that before the eighteenth amendment was adopted in the United States 33 States had adopted of their own volition state-wide prohibition. Nevertheless, the interstate traffic in liquor remained. The bootlegging from the 15 wet States to the 33 prohibition States produced a situation of defiance of law, of unenforceability of State prohibition statutes, with the result that in 1913, seven years before national prohibition became effective, the Congress of the United States passed, and then passed over the veto of President Taft by a two-thirds majority, a law which, stripped of its unnecessary words, reads as follows:

"That the shipment or transportation in any manner or by any means whatsoever of any intoxicating liquor of any kind from one State into any other State or from any foreign country into any State

which said intoxicating liquor is intended to be received, possessed, sold, or in any manner used in violation of any law of such State, is hereby prohibited."

And that law was sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Still, the States that wanted prohibition could not stop the flow of liquor over their borders from the States that still had the legalized sale. The temptation to the manufacturer, in the State that permitted manufacture, to spread his traffic; the temptation to the bootlegger—and "bootlegger" is not a word the eighteenth amendment put in our language, neither is "speak-easy"—the temptation to the bootlegger to transport his goods from the State that permitted the manufacture to the State that didn't was exactly the problem for the 33 dry States that we have to-day in all 48. And those 33 States—not for the purpose of enforcing their will upon us, but for their own protection and the enforcement of their own laws—found and felt that the only possible cure for this situation was to wipe out the traffic in liquor as a legal traffic, not only in 33 States but in 48 States. They had only one of two alternatives. When the Webb-Kenyon law—which I just read to you—had failed in its effect, when it had failed to achieve what had been hoped of it, they had only one of two alternatives—to establish a great national police force to police the borders of every one of the 33 dry States and prevent the interstate shipment of liquor from one State to the other; or the alternative which the Nation solemnly adopted, not by the vote of 33 but by the vote of 46 States—national prohibition of the traffic anywhere! [Applause.]

That's the history of prohibition as a national question, and when anybody in this or any other election attempts to say that you can repeal the amendment and still set up any vestige of authority in the Federal Government to regulate interstate commerce that the Webb-Kenyon law doesn't enunciate he speaks without knowledge of the legal facts and the effect and the history of prohibition.

It was the same experience under local option which finally produced state-wide prohibition in those 33 States, because the cities which didn't want it found that it was bootlegged over their borders from the cities which permitted its sale. Now, that must all be understood if we are going to discuss the possibility of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment or any method that is suggested for that repeal.

What is the method of repeal of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States? Well, first you have to get the consent of two-thirds of the Members of the House of Representatives and two-thirds of the Members of the United States Senate. The Webb-Kenyon law, the Volstead Act—the eighteenth amendment itself—had secured more than two-thirds of the votes in each branch of Congress. The first thing, then, that has to be done before the repeal of the amendment is possible is to convert the vote in each branch of Congress from over two-thirds favoring national prohibition along present lines to two-thirds against it. To-day nobody contends that in the Senate of the United States there are more than 22 Senators out of the 96 who would by any conceivable chance vote for the repeal—and the Senators who have been renominated or nominated for election in various States of the United States to-day—in the great Republican States of South Dakota, Illinois, and Pennsylvania—are all pledged to the eighteenth amendment. [Applause.] You have got to increase 22 Senators to 64 before you can get the resolution through the Senate—and we only elect one-third of the Senate every two years. It is going to take quite a while to change that.

Now, in the House there are only 61 Members to-day ready to stand up and be counted for any possible change in the law—61 out of 435 [applause]—even for a change in the Volstead Act, let alone the amendment. You have got to increase that 61 to 290 before you have two-thirds. There were 128 Members of the House who voted against the eighteenth amendment in 1917. There were 100 who voted against the Volstead Act; there were still about 100 when I entered Congress in 1924. To-day there are 61—and only 61. You have not only to reverse the downward trend in both the House and Senate but you have to convert it into a powerful upward swing, which will bring it up to a point that the wet forces have never had—that is, a two-thirds majority of the House and Senate—and you have got to do it in the face of the fact that not only have these senatorial primaries resulted as I have said but every Representative up for reelection in any State of the United States in any primary thus far held has been renominated—wet or dry—Illinois, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, wherever you look, every man has been renominated.

But let us assume that in 6 or 8 or 18 years you might get two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate. Then what have you got to do? Well, first, you have got to get them for the same plan—either Mr. Frelinghuysen's or Mr. Morrow's—or some other genius's. They can't vote for a different plan; they have all got to vote for the same one. After you get that you have then got to ratify that change by the votes of 36 States out of the 48, and you have got to get in each of those States both the house and the senate in favor of it. Thirty-three out of the 48 States were dry before the amendment; that leaves you only 15 which were not for state-wide prohibition before it was adopted; and it was ratified by 46 out of 48, remember. You have

to get 21 of the 33 States which had prohibition before the amendment to add to the wet 15 before you can ratify any change after you get two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate to say that they want to change it. And in that 15 you have to count New Jersey—New Jersey which ratified after a state-wide campaign. And in every speech I make I am challenging my opponents to name 11 out of the 21 counties in the State of New Jersey that will elect a senator to the State senate on the issue of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment who favors the repeal. [Applause.]

And this is supposed to be the wettest State in the Union! I put that up to two great political leaders in this State, both of whom would like to see it repealed. One of them named 6 which he thought he was sure of, and the other hoped for 8. You can't do it, and no man who knows the State of New Jersey can name 11 such counties out of the 21.

My friends, my opponents are taking quite a contract when they promise to the people of the State of New Jersey that their election will help or produce the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. How long is it going to take? It isn't going to come this year; it isn't going to come next year. It isn't going to come for very, very many years. Mr. BECK, a great antiprohibitionist in the House, conceded on the floor the practical irrepealability of the amendment and offered another solution; and even our own old Senator Edwards, whose wetness no one will question, said last week in reference to the speech of one of my opponents who declared for the repeal of the amendment: "He'd better say that in New Jersey if he wants to get elected, but it never will be repealed—and he knows it." [Applause.] The people of the State of New Jersey my friends, have elected Edwards governor, have elected Silzer governor, have elected Edwards Senator, have elected Edge Senator over a period of eight years for the purpose of a change in the law—and the only change in the law that has come has been to strengthen it! [Applause.]

Now, this is important—why is it chiefly important? It is important because there are real and grave evils in the present situation. But the cure for those evils is not to hold out false hopes to the man who wants the amendment repealed—not to give him the belief that his defiance, his disobedience of the law is a temporary thing—but is to put straightforwardly to every American citizen the fact that if he continues in nonobservance he is adopting a lifetime policy. You can't enforce this or any other law when the men who should be the great leaders on public thought give it a lip service for observance and enforcement and spend the rest of the time holding forth false hopes of its repeal. [Applause.]

Now, what are the evils? Well, one that I hear a good deal about is the loss of revenue and the cost of enforcement. I admit that apparently there is a loss. In the lobby committee hearings at Washington it developed that the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment was planning to circularize every man in the United States whose income was \$100,000 a year or over to point out to him that a 3-cent tax on each glass of beer would eliminate the corporate tax and the higher individual income taxes—and pass the taxes they were paying on to the people. But I say to my friends of wealth that the greater buying capacity of the American people for the necessities and luxuries of life produces more income to those very same men than they would save in taxes if they lost all of their tax bills. [Applause.]

The prosperity of this Nation in the last 10 years has outstripped any dreams of any nation in history. That prosperity has depended upon industrial efficiency and upon mass production. It has depended upon the market for luxuries and semiluxuries. There is not a home in America to-day, be it ever so humble, that has not behind its doors what in most of the rest of the world would be the height of luxury—and the purchases of the American people for those things have grown by leaps and bounds since the legalized traffic in liquor ceased. There is many a man who would lose his job if the traffic in liquor came back. Take the various branches of the automobile industry, for example. You can't buy gasoline and beverage alcohol out of the same pay envelope. [Applause.]

Now, as to the next issue. I am glad to see that one issue that has heretofore been made is not raised in this campaign. I honor Mr. Morrow for his courage and wisdom in conceding that there was nothing at all to the personal-liberty argument; that the Government had always had and always would have full power to regulate or prohibit the traffic in liquor; and, of course, that is so. If the right to have liquor is an inalienable right that goes to every American citizen, then the man who stands for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment must also stand for the substitution of an amendment which will prohibit any State from prohibiting the traffic. If it is the inalienable right of the American citizen to have it, then it is inconsistent with the institutions of our Nation that any State should prohibit it. That seems to me perfectly clear, and I am glad that neither of my opponents has fallen into that argument. That issue, like the light-wines-and-beer argument and the modification of the Volstead Act, is not involved in this campaign.

Then they talk about the youth of the land. That is something that touches pretty close to all of us. Personally, I want to record in the most emphatic way I can—and I have seen a lot of youngsters in the

last few years—that I believe in the youth of America and I believe they are going to be a finer generation than we are now. [Applause.] You notice that when people talk about the harm that prohibition is doing among the children it is usually somebody else's children they talk about. When anybody talks to me about the depravity of modern youth, I tell them to go back into a quiet corner and think about their own. And it is almost always other people's children, except occasionally, when you hear parents talk about it who are not observing the law themselves.

I can't see how any parent can expect his child to observe either parental authority or the law of the land if the parent denies to the law of the land the duty he owes it. I can't see how anybody who lived in New Jersey from 1890 to 1910, when I was growing up and in my young manhood, can say that there is more drinking among boys than there was then. I took drinking up myself as a boy of 18 at college because it seemed to me an absolute social necessity without which intercourse with other boys was practically an impossibility. When people tell me that it is worse now, I just don't believe them. [Applause.] They talk about the girls. Well, girls didn't use to smoke, did they? And if they went out to a dance they carried a chaperon and got home at midnight. Now they go out at midnight, and the chaperon is as extinct as the dodo. [Laughter.] I wonder how many mothers honestly think that their daughters have poorer promise of being fine mothers a few years from now than they had when they were their daughters' age. I have no fear for the girls of America. They are going to grow up to be the mothers of a finer next generation, just as the mothers of this generation are mothers of a finer one than the one that went before.

Then, they talk about drugs. Well, now, the difficulty of that is that it is a 2-edged sword for the antiprohibitionist, because the trouble with drugs is that even Government control doesn't seem able to stop the traffic. We have the strongest kind of prohibition of the drug traffic. Do they want to repeal it? Do they want State rights on drug control? Certainly not. What are the facts about drugs? They say there are a million users. Well, if there are, that's more than there are drunkards now. Would you legalize the traffic in drugs to get rid of them? Or would you keep it a secret, sneaky, back-alley thing? The Los Angeles Board of Health said that out of 500 addicts—and, by the way, I got this out of the Literary Digest, which is sort of a bible for the antiprohibitionist [laughter]—the Los Angeles Board of Health says that out of 500 cases of drug addicts that they examined there were either three or five, or some such number, who were the result of prohibition.

What is the truth? The truth is, first, that drug addiction and liquor are almost never found in the same individuals. It is a different kind of craving. The truth is, secondly, that drug addiction usually comes from its use in a medicinal way. The liquor habit usually comes from social indulgence. And then how can prohibition have caused drug addiction if there is as much liquor around to drink as antiprohibitionists say there is? Liquor is cheaper even now than cocaine—and easier to get, so the antiprohibitionists say. My friends, in the drug habit you are dealing with a different type of thing from the liquor habit, and there is little or no association between them. The only similarity is that the traffic in each is an evil thing that can be dealt with only by the strong arm of the Government.

Then they come to graft and corruption—and that's bad. But is it anything new? Can anybody remember a time—whether the liquor traffic was legal or illegal—when it has not had its political effect, when it has not been accompanied by graft and corruption? I can't. Graft and corruption is its hand maiden, and it always was. And would they repeal the laws against gambling, against the trade of gambling? Plenty of graft and corruption in connection with that. Shall we repeal the laws against public gambling in order to stop the graft and corruption?

How about interstate traffic if we go back to State rights? Is there going to be no graft and corruption in that? If Pennsylvania is dry and New York is wet, isn't anybody going to pay any money to get liquor across the border between the States? Isn't anybody going to pay money to the police of Philadelphia or Pittsburgh to run a speak-easy? My friends, with 33 States dry and 15 wet, you would have the identical condition of corruption—and you would have it in a more difficult form, because you would have legalized manufacture from which the liquor could flow. There is only one way to stop graft, and that is to keep the traffic outlawed and give to the American people leadership toward observance of the law. [Applause.]

How are you going to deal with this condition pending the repeal that these other gentlemen urge? I have pointed out to you that it will take years and years to repeal it—if it's ever repealed—and throughout that entire period you are going to have these great men of eminent respectability and fine talents preach to the people of America that the law is a temporary thing; that it is a hateful thing; that it is a thing we must get rid of. Are our inferior officers in the offices of the government going to have any zeal for enforcement when the leaders feel that way? Are the people going to become keyed up to a realization of the duties of good citizenship when their leaders talk that way? The reason that I am in this campaign, despite all other suggestions, is that a year or two ago I made up my mind that the question of

prohibition and the evils of prohibition would never be settled in the United States of America until men who not only saw the evils but also saw the good were ready to stand up and fight on this question. [Applause.]

Now, what are the benefits? I told you about the evils. What are the benefits? The benefits are economic, they are social, they are translated into the happiness of wives and children. You don't see many human derelicts on the streets any more. Read Evangeline Booth's testimony on that subject. You see mighty few wives toiling to support drunken husbands. They used to be a fixture, as Samuel Crowther said. Our children through our schools so that we can hardly build enough to house them. They don't have to go to work so young as once they did. Washing machines have replaced taking in washing. My friends, in these 10 years we have stepped forward and forward with gigantic strides. We are on the verge of the 5-day week in industry, in business, because we have advanced so far and so fast in industrial efficiency and methods that we can't keep our people busy all the time and give everybody a job. Ireland has had to adopt a law closing all the public drinking places at 3 o'clock on the day before a holiday and keep them closed until the day after.

England has had to adopt a law closing public drinking places from 11 o'clock until 2 in the afternoon every day. Why? Because without those laws they can not match the industrial efficiency of the American workman since we no more have the legalized sale of liquor. My friends, the restoration of the legalized traffic of liquor in this country would ruin every step we have made in 10 years. All these benefits may not be due to prohibition; but it's a fact that we are the only great Nation in the world that has had prohibition in those 10 years—and we are the only Nation where all these things have happened. Certainly, if prohibition didn't cause them, it didn't hinder them. My belief is that our industry, our health, our happiness depend upon the continued diversion of our pay rolls from the purchase of liquor to the necessities and the luxuries of life. [Applause.]

I have 225 years of New Jersey blood, and the insulting phrase that I hear so often—that New Jersey is the wettest State in the Union—hurts. Sometimes I am afraid it's true. Why is it true? Not that the people of New Jersey are any less patriotic—are any less law-observing—are any less willing to give up their own pleasure for their fellow man than the people of other States. No; it is because for 10 years the political leadership of this State has boasted that it would make the State wetter than the Atlantic Ocean! It's because every ounce of leadership that there has been has been opposed to prohibition. With your help and the help of the rest of the people of New Jersey I want to clear the name of my native State. [Applause.] I want to put New Jersey back into the Union—back into the Union with her old banner of "Jersey justice" flying—with her motto, "Law observance." [Great applause.]

ADDRESS OF HON. MAURICE H. THATCHER

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, at the recent commencement exercises of the University of Alabama, which have just been concluded in my home city of Tuscaloosa, the board of trustees of the university conferred on Hon. MAURICE H. THATCHER the honorary degree of doctor of laws. I wish now to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a most interesting address delivered by Mr. THATCHER at the annual alumni meeting, held in Tutwiler Hall on the afternoon of May 26, 1930. The address was enthusiastically received by a large and representative audience.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
The address is as follows:

THE PANAMA CANAL—ITS HISTORY AND SIGNIFICANCE

At the outset I desire to acknowledge with the deepest sense of appreciation the very great honor and compliment which has been paid me by the invitation to address you on this occasion. I have been delighted to accept that invitation and to be with you. I am very happy to meet the very able and distinguished president of the university, Doctor Denny, members of the faculty, many of your students, and so great a number of the alumni. The University of Alabama is, indeed, famed at home and abroad for its great educational, cultural, and inspirational achievements. Its students and graduates by their splendid accomplishments in every worthy field have carried throughout the Nation and across the seas the fame of this great center of learning. The university has a past of which it may well be proud, a present that is worthy of its past, and it now moves on to a future that, rooted in and inspired by all that has gone before, shall be of the most splendid and outstanding character.

The opportunity which has thus come to me is doubly appreciated; first, because of the high honor that is borne by any invitation which may be given by or for the university; and, second, because of certain other considerations which most strongly appeal to me from a personal and sentimental standpoint. I trust that I may be pardoned in briefly alluding to those considerations. One of my best friends in the House of Representatives is a graduate of this great institution and formerly

served as dean of its law school. He is an invaluable Member of the House and is possessed of the highest mental and moral gifts. During the seven and a half years of my congressional tenure I have served with him as a Member of the House and also as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, and I feel that after this period of close personal and official contact and association with him I am fairly well qualified to appraise his character and worth.

I, therefore, suggest that no man in either branch of the National Legislature stands higher than does he. His habits of industry and investigation, his effectiveness of speech, his courtesy in debate, his fairness of viewpoint, his patriotic outlook, his wide information, and his wise judgment and courageous action all contribute to render him one of the most useful Members of Congress, and he is performing for his State and Nation services of the most inestimable character. Because of the high regard and affectionate esteem in which I hold him, I feel that I owe it to him and to his friends in his home community here and now to say as much. I refer, of course, to the Representative in Congress from this district, Hon. WILLIAM B. OLIVER.

In this connection I may add that my relationships with the distinguished congressional delegation of your great State as a whole have been of the most pleasant character. I recall also that one of the ablest men Alabama has ever sent to the Halls of Congress was a Kentuckian by birth, Louisville being the place of his nativity, Senator Oscar W. Underwood.

GENERALS GORGAS AND SIBERT

Again, as some of you may know, it was my greatly esteemed privilege to have served on the Isthmian Canal Commission during the peak of the construction period—that is to say, during the years 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1913—with two of Alabama's most distinguished and greatly beloved sons, Gen. William C. Gorgas and Gen. William L. Sibert. The first named some years ago passed to his eternal reward, leaving behind him a record of noble, unselfish, effective, humanitarian service, unexcelled, as I believe, in all the world's history. At Ancon, in the Canal Zone, the chief offices of the department of civil administration, of which department I had the honor to be the head, were in the same building where there were maintained the chief offices of the department of sanitation, of which General Gorgas was the head. In addition we both resided in Ancon, our homes being very near each other. Mrs. Thatcher and I had never met the Gorgases before we went to the Isthmus, but we had heard of them and of how they were universally beloved for their wonderful qualities of head and heart.

Thus I was thrown into the most cordial and intimate relationship with General Gorgas, then Colonel Gorgas; and this was true as regards Mrs. Thatcher and Mrs. Gorgas; and one of the most grateful and tender memories of the lives of my wife and myself is that of our association with the Gorgases on the Isthmus of Panama. In Washington, after I came to Congress, which was after the death of General Gorgas, Mrs. Thatcher and I were able to renew our delightful association with Mrs. Gorgas. Some months ago, however, this splendid helpmate of the world's greatest sanitarian, to the great shock and grief of her innumerable friends, went to join him in "sunlit fields." Two finer, nobler, more useful lives have never been lived in this Nation of ours; and the story of their union, and of their comradeship through the years, forms one of the most beautiful that may be encountered in the pages of history.

Except for the indispensable work of General Gorgas in ridding the Isthmus of yellow fever and plague, and except for the unequalled sanitary work in the Canal Zone and its environs, in the reduction of malaria under his attack, thus repeating the splendid work he performed in "cleaning up" Cuba, the Panama Canal would never have been built, unless another Gorgas had come upon the scene; but thus far the world has produced only one William Crawford Gorgas.

And here in this university place it is gratifying to know that the two sisters of General Gorgas yet live, bearing the love and esteem of all who know them, and occupying the selfsame residence where their revered parents once lived. One of these esteemed survivors yet holds, I believe, a position of honor and trust in your university organization, just as did her mother before her. Also, I believe, Gen. Josiah Gorgas, the father of Gen. William C. Gorgas, once served as president of this institution. Hence the name of Gorgas has been associated for a great many years with the University of Alabama, and runs like a golden thread through the university's history.

And speaking of the mother of General Gorgas, of sanitary fame, may I be permitted to recall an incident which may hold something of interest and appeal for you. On the Isthmus, at Ancon, on a certain morning during my service there, I had occasion to confer with General Gorgas touching certain official matters. Accordingly, I went from my office on the second floor of the administration building to his office on the first floor. He welcomed me in his usual gentle and cordial way, and told me that he had just received the news of his mother's death; and then, with serene and smiling face, he proceeded to speak of her lovely graces, her great qualities of mind and heart, of interesting incidents about her, of her useful and unselfish life, and of the ripe but youthful age which she had attained before passing into the

Great Beyond. In speaking of her in terms of idealization, reverence, and love, he seemed very happy. Whatever pain may have tugged at his heart seemed to yield—so far as visible evidence or expression was concerned—to the proud satisfaction and memory which were his because of the fact that he had been blessed with such a mother. To him she was not dead, and could never be. He thought of her only in terms of life and loveliness. I was very much struck and touched with his brave, cheerful, smiling manner; and this attitude was characteristic of him. He always possessed the power to look into the heart of things, and to interpret them. He ever sought to avoid the thorn and find the rose. To know General Gorgas was to love him. Strong, gentle, patient, persistent, courageous, clear-visioned, and high-purposed, he was "master of his event," and in his great service for humanity he won a place among the immortals.

As for General Sibert, I can speak of him in much the same manner as I have spoken of General Gorgas. He is claimed as an adopted son of Kentucky, and Kentuckians join you in the feeling of State pride because of his great achievements. Upon leaving the United States Military Academy, upon graduation, he was assigned to duty as engineer in charge of the improvements on two of Kentucky's most important streams, Green and Barren Rivers, in the western portion of the State where I grew to manhood. In that work he achieved distinction, and his splendid ability, together with his strong, genial nature, made friends of all with whom he came in contact. These friendships survived separation and the passing of the years; and when his great work was finished on the Isthmus, he purchased a farm adjacent to Bowling Green, where he had lived when he first came to Kentucky, and there on Barren River he to-day makes his permanent home.

General Sibert has had a career of the greatest eminence. On the indicated streams in Kentucky, and later, with widened jurisdiction in which was included an important section of the Ohio River, as United States engineer, at Louisville; also as engineer in charge of the upper Ohio, he assumed and discharged his duties in such a way as to bring him to the front rank among the engineers of the Nation. Thus he came to be chosen by President Roosevelt as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission in 1907, and served until the commission's work was completed in 1914. In that capacity he built the great locks and the dam at Gatun, and dredged the channel of the canal from Gatun to the open sea. In the successful negotiation of these great engineering features he won rank among the world's most outstanding engineers, and imperishable fame. During the World War, at home and abroad, he served the cause of the American and Allied arms with great honor and distinction. More recently, as you know, he has served, and is yet serving, I believe, as chairman and chief engineer of the Alabama State Docks Commission; and in the construction of model docks at Mobile there is to be found but another evidence of his splendid professional and executive ability. These modern and efficient shipping facilities will enable the great State of Alabama to utilize, in a way hitherto unknown to it, the agency of the Panama Canal to quicken and increase her trade with Latin America and the Orient.

In the Canal Zone I counted General Sibert as a close friend and wise counselor, and the association there with him, both personally and officially, I prize as one of the most gratifying and valued of the memories I hold of the Isthmus.

As General Sibert is an alumnus of the University of Alabama, all of you must be proud of his great success in life; and we in Kentucky, who call him fellow Kentuckian, join you in Alabama, who call him fellow Alabamian, in the earnest hope that for many years to come he may be spared for further usefulness to the country he has served so long and so well.

Thus the University of Alabama presents to me the strongest possible appeal, and not only to me but to Mrs. Thatcher as well; and she has come with me to Tuscaloosa to see this historic institution and to meet and mingle with you. She joins me in thanking you a thousand times for the cordial greeting you have given us and for the charming hospitality Doctor and Mrs. Howe, Doctor Ott, Doctor and Mrs. Denny, and all of you are according us.

THE PANAMA CANAL

When it came to choosing a subject upon which to address you I was in something of a quandary. No theme had been assigned me, and it was very difficult to determine what particular one might appeal to you; but it occurred to me that possibly some discussion of the Panama Canal might interest you, especially so as I might venture to speak of it because of my service in connection with its construction; and because also of the fact that through two of her native sons, the State of Alabama, as has just been stated, played such an important part in that construction.

I thought that I might bring to your minds afresh the fact that not only did your own beloved Commonwealth make such an invaluable contribution to the successful negotiation of this vast project, but that the South, generally, in very high degree, contributed in this result. And then I thought again that some brief historical background of the Isthmian enterprise, together with some statement of its physical features, supplemented by some suggestion of sequences and significances, as I am able to see them, might be appropriately presented. My good

friend Congressman OLIVER, to whom I mentioned the matter, thought that an address along these lines might be deemed desirable; and thus has been predicated and fashioned what I shall have to say.

Therefore, at the risk of being trite, and at the further risk of recalling to your minds some very well-known facts and deductions, I venture to proceed in the indicated manner.

We are to-day living in a wonderful age—the age of a million contacts—and one of the most absorbing in all the world's history. Progress in the arts and sciences in the present generation has been unprecedented. In fact, this progress has been such that our lives in America have almost been revolutionized within the past 25 years. The development of the agencies of communication and transportation has been of the greatest and most significant character. The automobile and hard roads contribute to bring about closer, quicker contacts on land, thus aiding the railroad lines of the country in this regard.

The dream of a heavier-than-air flying machine has come true; and in our own and foreign lands, airplanes, with almost the speed of light, traverse the skies, carrying passengers, the mails, and articles of commerce. The giant airship has also been developed to such an extent that with cargoes of passengers and freight it may cross the seas, circle the globe, and thus join the airplane in its conquest of the air. The radio or wireless, perhaps the most uncanny of all inventions, to-day performs its miracle of sound transmission through every land and clime, and by means of its mysterious power it has come to pass that the least, low whisper may be heard all round the earth. The simplest statement of present-day facts exceeds the most extravagant stories of romance and imagination of other days. Lindbergh's lone flight across the Atlantic, Byrd's flights over the two poles, the passage by plane over the vast Pacific navigated by American and British airmen, and the belting of the globe itself by Eckener and his party in the *Graf Zeppelin*, constitute deeds of daring and high adventure of the most heroic character, and, for boldness of conception, courage, and skill in execution, and in dramatic appeal and effect, they have never been equaled in the world's history. Yet the marvel of to-day is likely to become the commonplace of to-morrow. The pioneers of earth and air and sea with dauntless spirit put everything to the hazard of a touch. If they lose, they are generally accounted vain and foolish. If they win, they are acclaimed heroes for all time, and on their bold achievements is based the progress of the future. Nevertheless the success of those who accomplish great things is largely dependent upon the sacrifices, the experiences, and mistakes of those who fail. So it has come to pass that the old maxim to the effect that what man has done, man can do, has been transformed, in the light of modern achievement, into "what man can not do, man will do." Certainly this, in substance, is true touching material progress and material accomplishment, whatever may be our doubts upon the score of the world's moral and spiritual advance. One of the great problems of to-day is how to prevent the agencies of civilization from becoming Frankenstein's to destroy us.

AMERICA UNDERTAKES THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PANAMA CANAL

Thus it came about that within the present generation the American Nation undertook the greatest industrial enterprise of history, that of constructing a trans-Isthmian canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The French had failed in their attempt to construct such a waterway at Panama, and that failure constitutes one of the most tragic episodes of history. The war between the United States and Spain in 1898, and the consequences which flowed therefrom, taught our people two great lessons. The first was that of the need, from the standpoint of our military and naval protection, for the construction of the Isthmian Canal. The long, thrilling flight of the battleship *Oregon* from our northwest coast down around the southern tip of South America, and thence northwardly to Cuban waters in time to assist the American squadron in the destruction of the Spanish fleet in Santiago Bay, impressed in the most forcible manner the value of such a connecting waterway through Central America. The second lesson was that afforded by the "clean-up" of Habana by our Army upon American occupation at the close of that war, and the absolute eradication of yellow fever, and the great reduction of malaria in Cuba. The need for such connecting link between the two great oceans being thus so strikingly revealed to our people, caused them to resolve without delay to take the necessary steps for the achievement of this mighty project. The lessons learned in Cuba gave our people encouragement to believe that what was done in Cuba in a sanitary way under the leadership of Gorgas, might also be done on the Isthmus of Panama, which was then accounted to be the greatest plague spot in existence. When the American people are really in earnest there seems to be no undertaking too great for their achievement. The spirit of the individual heroes of our American life finds its collective expression in the ardent purposes of a great people, rich beyond all others in vision, skill, and daring, and also surpassing all others in the possession of material means with which to accomplish great ends.

EARLY ISTHMIAN HISTORY

Before proceeding further, however, with the story of the actual construction of the Panama Canal, permit me to present something of

historical background. The Isthmus of Panama, ever since its discovery by the early Spanish navigators, has been a land of entrancing historic and romantic interest; so much so, that, in any narrative relative to the canal, one is tempted to wander off into numberless by-paths. In his epoch-making voyage to the westward, over the unknown "Sea of Darkness," the inspiration which dominated the great-souled Columbus was the hope that he would discover a western passage to the Indies.

On his fourth voyage to the New World, further endeavoring to find such a passage, and having been told by the natives of the West Indian Islands that there was a strait through which one could pass westward into waters which led directly to the much-famed land he was seeking, Columbus cruised along the Atlantic shores of the Isthmus of Panama from September, 1502, to January, 1503, and on November 2, 1502, discovered and named the Bay of Porto Bello (beautiful harbor), located 20 miles east of the Atlantic entrance to the canal. He sought to find this passage, but he was doomed to disappointment. His efforts were in vain. He died in the belief that he had found the western shores of the continent of which the Indies were a part; hence the name "West Indies" bestowed by him on the islands he discovered in the west Atlantic waters.

In some quarters, however, it has been claimed that Columbus was not the first civilized man to touch the Isthmian shores. That honor has been urged in behalf of at least two others, both Spanish navigators, who, inspired by the voyages of Columbus, are said to have visited the Atlantic coast of the Isthmus in 1501. One of these was Alonso de Ojeda, and the other was Rodrigo de Bastidas. It has also been claimed that Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, a hardy Spanish cavalier, was with Bastidas when the latter visited the Central American shores in 1501. Eight years later the first Spanish settlement on the mainland of the New World was planted at Nombre de Dios (Name of God), on the Atlantic coast, a few miles southeast of the Bay of Porto Bello, Balboa being its head. No Spanish exploration of the interior country was attempted, however, for several years because of the mountainous barriers and practically impenetrable jungle everywhere to be encountered; but the story of the Indians who inhabited the country to the effect that there was a wealth of gold in that interior; and also, that another great sea lay southward at a comparatively short distance from the Atlantic, finally influenced Balboa, in 1513, to start upon the journey of exploration that proved to be so greatly historical in results. Accompanied by a small band of about 200 Spanish soldiers and Indian guides, and after days of most difficult and dangerous passage through jungles and over mountains, on September 25, 1513, he discovered the Pacific Ocean; and on September 29 he claimed formal possession thereof in the name of the King and Queen of Castile, naming it Mar del Sur (Southern Sea).

The name Pacific was not applied until seven years later when it was bestowed by Magellan, the great Portuguese navigator. Balboa first beheld the waters of the Pacific from a mountain peak in the Darien country, southeastward from the site of the present canal. Traditionally it has been claimed that Balboa was familiar with that part of the Isthmus of Panama occupied by the Panama Canal Zone; but there is no authentic record to substantiate this. In the interior of the Canal Zone there is an elevation of something over 1,000 feet above sea level, called Balboa Hill, from which on a clear day both oceans may be seen. From this elevation I have seen both the Atlantic and Pacific waters, and last summer when Mrs. Thatcher and I flew from ocean to ocean over the Panama Canal, in this mid section of the Canal Zone we were able to see, from the plane, both oceans.

Balboa's discovery of the Pacific revealed definitely to civilization the fact of the narrow strip of land lying between the two great oceans and connecting the two great continents, afterwards to be known as North and South America. Immediately there sprang into the brain of man a dream that would vex it for nearly 400 years, and until it ultimately came true; that is to say, the dream of an artificial waterway to connect the two oceans. For about 100 years the Spanish settlement at Nombre de Dios was maintained; and then on account of the healthier location at Porto Bello the former place was abandoned and the colony was maintained at Porto Bello. In this connection it is interesting to note that the rock necessary for use in the concrete construction of the locks at Gatun was secured from quarries at Porto Bello. At the mouth of the Bay of Porto Bello Sir Francis Drake, world navigator, one of Great Britain's naval heroes and long the scourge of the Spanish Main, found his grave in 1596. It is believed that he died of yellow fever, a malady prevalent in this part of the world ever since the white man made his advent there, but to which the native people are immune.

In 1519 the Spanish founded the old city of Panama on the Pacific shore, about 7 miles from the present city and the Pacific entrance of the canal, and less than 9° north of the Equator. Considerable gold was found by the Spaniards among the natives and in the country now constituting the Panamanian Republic; hence came the early Spanish designation of this land, *Castilla del Oro* (Castle of Gold); and in the contiguous waters of the Pacific Ocean, especially in and about Pearl Islands, lying in the Gulf of Panama, a great many valuable pearls were found; and the pearl industry in these islands has

survived to this day. In a little while the ancient city of Panama became a Spanish treasure house. In 1532 Pizarro outfitted from this city and sailed southward to make his ruthless and historic conquest of Peru, ultimately bringing back the treasure confiscated from the Incas of that country; whence same, or, at least, a material portion thereof, was carried across the Isthmus to the Atlantic shore, and thence transhipped to Spain. For 150 years this city continued to be the chief treasure place for Spain in the New World, and during practically the whole of that period its precious store, largely secured from the primitive peoples of Central and South America, was carried on pack mules, and on the backs of slaves, first over arduous trails and later over the "royal" paved roads, *los caminos reales*, from Panama to Nombre de Dios and Porto Bello; and thence shipped in the much-famed Spanish galleons to the royal treasuries at Madrid. The remains of these old paved roadways are to be seen in the Isthmian jungles to-day.

In the course of time, however, it was inevitable that such a treasure city should tempt the cupidity of the bold and daring pirates that infested the West Indian seas. Thus it was that in 1671, three years after he had sacked Porto Bello, Henry Morgan, a bold Welshman who had developed into the most successful pirate of his day, landed on the Atlantic shore of the Isthmus, and with a band of daredevils and cut-throats crossed the Isthmus, after a journey of incredible hardship, and fell upon the city of Panama and sacked and destroyed it. Morgan and his fellow pirates were called "buccaneers," a term derived through the fact that it was first applied to Frenchmen who smoked and cured meats on "bucans"—racks or frames—in Hispaniola (Haiti), and who, upon being driven from their occupation by the Spanish authorities, became pirates. The destruction wrought by Morgan was complete. He took his treasure back to the Atlantic side, and then, it is recorded, he robbed most of his fellow buccaneers of their share of the spoil and sailed away. It would be interesting to follow Morgan's career and point out how he was knighted by the English Government because of his piracies against the Spanish; how he sacked other cities in Central America and the West Indian islands; how he was afterwards made lieutenant governor of Jamaica, and was, as some historians relate, imprisoned because of his peculations and bitterly complained of the "injustice" done him; or how, as other writers declare, as governor he suppressed piracy with an iron hand. But all this, however, is "another story."

EVOLUTION OF ISTHMIAN CANAL IDEA

Spanish and Portuguese navigators, immediately following the discovery of the New World, tried in vain to find the mythical passage that led to the Orient. Impelled by the desire to find it, Magellan explored the whole east coast of South America, passing from "lands of sun" to "lands of snow," and finally discovered the strait near the extreme southern point of South America, which has since borne his name, and in 1521 became the first navigator to cross the Pacific Ocean.

As already suggested, the idea of a water link across the Isthmus to connect the two oceans sprang up with the earliest Spanish occupation. One of Balboa's followers on the Isthmus, a Spanish engineer named Saavedra, is reputed to have first advocated the project somewhere between 1517 and 1523. Some historians claim that the originator of the idea was Cortez, the conqueror of Mexico, who sought to find the fabled passage to the Pacific Ocean, and, failing to find it, proposed the bold enterprise of cutting a canal across the Isthmus, and thereupon enlisted his cousin, Saavedra, in the matter. In any event, the latter did make a study of the subject and was the first engineer to do so. His investigations covered several years, and he was on the eve of sending his plans to Charles I, King of Spain (Charles V, of the Holy Roman Empire), but his (Saavedra's) death prevented in 1529. Surveys of the Isthmus were ordered with the object of a canal in view, but as the work was reported to be impracticable, it was not undertaken. The successor of Charles I, Philip II, in the year 1567, had an engineer to make a survey of what came to be known as the Nicaraguan route, with the result that an unfavorable report was given.

It is related that Philip, in his doubt touching the matter, called upon the Dominican friars to furnish a solution; that the latter, after seeking biblical information and inspiration on the subject, offered the answer in the passage "What God had joined together, let no man put asunder"; and that this convinced the King that it was sacrilege to undertake the construction of a waterway which would sever the two Americas. We do not vouch for the authenticity of this story, but it is an interesting thread which has been woven into the fabric of Panama Canal history, and we herewith submit it. Be the fact as it may, Philip abandoned the idea of the canal, and, so far as any substantial activity was concerned, it thenceforth slept for 200 years.

The idea was revitalized in the early part of the nineteenth century. Central and South American countries became restive under the Spanish yoke, and Spain sought to divert them from their dreams of independence. In the year 1814 she directed the construction of a canal across the Isthmus, but before any progress could be made to carry out this direction, the colonies of Central and South America began the movement which resulted in their independence. Thenceforth Spain ceased to be a factor touching a Central American canal, though in the actual

construction of it by the American Nation Spain made substantial contribution by furnishing thousands of laborers, the best, perhaps, of all the unskilled employees.

England became interested in the project toward the close of the eighteenth century, and had famous representatives in the persons of Baron von Humboldt and Lord Nelson, who made investigations and submitted reports on Central American canal routes. Also about the same time Germany's great poet, statesman, and seer, Goethe, made a prophecy, wonderful in its conception and verity. It was to the effect that the people of the United States in time would inhabit and control the North American Pacific coast, and would also, through the necessities of the situation, construct an isthmian canal to give expeditious connection between the eastern and western shores of North America.

The great South American liberator, Simon Bolivar, then President of the Republic of New Granada, which included the present domain of the Panamanian Republic, in 1825, granted Baron Thiery, a Frenchman, a franchise for the construction of a canal across the Panamanian Isthmus; but the French nobleman did not succeed in raising the requisite capital for the work, and accomplished nothing. Thereupon President Bolivar employed a British engineer, one I. A. Lloyd, to make a survey of the Isthmus for either a road or canal.

In the year 1835, the people of our own country having become interested in the canal project, there was passed in the Senate a resolution introduced by Henry Clay, agreeably to which Charles Biddle was commissioned by President Jackson to visit the Isthmus of Panama and to investigate and make report of the feasibility of different routes for a permanent means of isthmian communication between the two oceans.

Biddle went to the Isthmus and after investigation decided that the Panama route was the most available. Thereupon he went to Bogota and secured a franchise to build a railroad across the Isthmus. But the time was not yet ripe for carrying out such a work, and the undertaking was abandoned. In the year 1838 a French company was formed and a concession was granted to it for the construction of a means of communication across the Isthmus, either by railroad, highway, or canal. An engineer, Napoleon Garella, made investigations and reported to the French Government, declaring that the only practical method of trans-Isthmian communication was a canal. Nothing, however, came of the venture.

Once again the people of our own country became interested in the subject. The acquisition of the vast western domain resulting from the war with Mexico, and the discovery of gold in California in 1849, intensified that interest. Thousands of our people from the Mississippi Valley and the East, fired with lure of the precious metal, found the most feasible route to the California gold fields to run southward by sea to the Atlantic shores of the Isthmus; thence across Panama to the Pacific; thence northwestward by sea to the Golden Gate. This was a long and arduous journey, but it was greatly shorter than that by Cape Horn or the Magellan Strait; and, in the absence of trans-continental railroads, by a large number it was preferred to those historic routes, which so many others pursued, across the great plains and deserts of our western country, where fever, famine, and murderous Indians took their heavy toll from those pioneers who thus sought to reach the New Eldorado.

Three American citizens—Messrs. Chauncey, Stephens, and Aspinwall—in the year 1848 secured from the Republic of New Granada a concession or franchise for the construction of a trans-Isthmian railroad, and in 1849 secured, under the laws of the State of New York, a special charter incorporating the Panama Railroad Co.; and in the same year this company began, and in 1855 completed, from the present city of Colon at the Atlantic entrance of the canal to the present city of Panama at the Pacific entrance, a railroad. This construction was epoch making. Because of the great difficulties encountered, the pestilential country and the lack of sanitation, the inadequacy of engineering equipment and the difficulty of securing labor, the construction of the Panama Railroad was perhaps as great an achievement as the construction of the Panama Canal under conditions of effective sanitation and adequate engineering equipment. In addition, a comprehensive plan of organization for the building and operation of the Panama Railroad, embracing as it did quarters for employees, commissaries, schools, churches, hospitals, and medical attention, furnished the model for the comprehensive and elaborated plan of the final canal organization of the Americans.

The construction and operation of the Panama Railroad having provided a means of commercial communication between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, had the effect of holding in abeyance, from the standpoint of governmental consideration, the question of an interoceanic canal. However, in the next few years many Central American canal routes were surveyed and exploited through individual promotions; perhaps through a score of them. The two chief routes which received serious consideration, however, were those of Nicaragua and Panama.

In 1869, because of the agitation on the canal subject and the failure of the Panama Railroad adequately to meet the demands of interoceanic communication, President Grant appointed an Interoceanic Canal Commission, with the result that a treaty was, in 1870, negotiated between the United States and the Republic of Colombia for the construction of a canal, based on the condition that the work would

be entered upon if a satisfactory right of way could be found. Because the franchise of the Panama Railroad Co. covered the territory in respect to construction of a canal in its vicinity, investigation was made of a number of other probable routes, with the result that recommendation was made in 1876 for the construction of an interoceanic canal over what has been termed the "Nicaragua route"; that is to say, through Nicaragua, one of the Central American countries lying northwestward of Panama. However, before the United States took any definite step toward construction, the French people became interested in the project, and Napoleon B. Wyse, a young French officer, in 1878, secured a franchise from the Colombian Government relative to the construction of a canal.

THE FRENCH ATTEMPT

But we must hasten. In 1879 there was convened in Paris, under the direction of Ferdinand de Lesseps, the builder of the Suez Canal, an international congress of survey for an interoceanic canal to consider the question of the best location and plan of such connecting waterway. The congress decided in favor of the Panama route, and a so-called "sea-level" canal, extending from Limon Bay on the Atlantic side to Panama Bay on the Pacific—the route of the present canal. The estimated cost was \$240,000,000. A French company was organized, money was raised through private sources, and the work of construction begun under a concession from the Republic of Colombia. Years of effort at construction followed, but failure at last crowned that effort in 1904. Yellow fever, bubonic plague, malaria, and other malignant diseases took their fearful toll of those employed in the work, and other insurmountable difficulties presented themselves in the physical conditions encountered, in the waste and graft involved, and in the lack of adequate machinery.

ENTRY OF THE UNITED STATES

Then, as already indicated, the United States came into the picture; Congress passed the necessary legislation, there were purchased the French interests, and our Government entered upon the work of construction in 1904, and completed it in 1914, at a total cost of about \$375,000,000.

A commission appointed under authority of the Congress of the United States in 1899 made a study of the subject, and submitted a final report in 1902 in favor of the Panama route. The lock plan of construction was adopted, and the canal was accordingly built. The Chagres River was dammed at Gatun, 7 miles from deep water in the Atlantic and there was thus formed Gatun Lake, about 85 feet above sea level, and covering about 165 square miles of territory in the Canal Zone and in the Republic of Panama. Six great locks were constructed at Gatun on the Atlantic side; that is to say, three twin flights, each with a lift of 28½ feet, and each lock chamber 1,000 feet long, 110 feet wide, and 80 feet deep; and a like number of locks in like form and with like lifts were built on the Pacific side; and, in addition, the continental divide was reduced to the 85-foot lake level through Culebra Cut. It is to be noted that the tidal variation at the Atlantic entrance of the canal is about 26 inches; whereas the tidal variation at the Pacific entrance is more than 21 feet.

The Province of Panama withdrew from the Republic of Colombia in 1903, and thereupon was negotiated the necessary treaty between the United States and the Republic of Panama for the cession of the Canal Zone strip, 10 miles wide and extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, nearly 50 miles; and for the construction, maintenance, sanitation operation, and protection of the canal. Congress in 1902 created the Isthmian Canal Commission consisting of seven members, which undertook the work of construction, and finally carried it to successful completion.

This commission was made of 4 United States Army Engineers, 1 United States naval engineer, 1 officer of the United States Army Medical Corps, and 1 civilian. In this connection it is interesting to note that for most of the period of the construction of the canal, four of the seven commissioners were from the South. Thus from April 7, 1907, to October, 1909, these four were Colonels Gorgas and Sibert, former Senator Jo C. S. Blackburn, of Kentucky—serving as a member under the popular designation of "Governor" of the Canal Zone—whom I had the honor to succeed in the spring of 1910, and Col. David D. Gaillard, of South Carolina. Moreover, there were engaged in the work as officials and employees a very large number of men and women from the South, in the various skilled capacities required.

Colonel Gaillard deserves more than a passing mention. His work, as engineer in charge of the excavation of the Culebra Cut section of the canal was of outstanding importance. He literally sacrificed his life in that work and died in December, 1913, a veritable "Martyr of the Ditch"; and to commemorate his brilliant Isthmian achievements the name "Culebra Cut," by Executive order of President Wilson, was changed to "Gaillard Cut."

The South therefore made a most notable contribution to the work of this great enterprise.

THREE DEPARTMENTS

There were established and maintained on the Canal Zone three great departments—engineering, sanitary, and civil administration. The work

of the sanitary department included all matters of health and sanitation; that of engineering comprehended, of course, all the engineering plans and construction; while that of civil administration had grouped within it all the civil activities, such as schools, prisons, road construction, customs, revenues, the courts, fire and police divisions, postal activities, and the like. During the construction days there were as many as 75,000 people on the zone—about 10,000 white Americans—men, women, and children; and the remainder made up of every race and tongue, a veritable Babel. Hence, every civil activity had to be maintained in the Canal Zone.

The canal was divided into three great divisions of engineering—the Atlantic, under Colonel Sibert; the central, under Colonel Gaillard; and the Pacific, under Sidney B. Williamson, a civilian engineer.

General supervisory powers were conferred on the chairman and chief engineer of the commission, a position which was held first by John F. Stevens, a civilian, and later by Col. (afterwards Gen.) George W. Goethals.

The sanitary work of the canal was placed under the supervision of General Gorgas—then Colonel Gorgas—and in 1907 he was made a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission. Colonel Gorgas had cleaned up Habana and stamped out yellow fever there after it was definitely determined by careful demonstration that the stegomyia mosquito transmitted the disease, and his splendid work in Cuba was repeated upon the Isthmus. This place of deadly pestilence, of yellow fever and wholesale malaria, has thus become one of the most wholesome spots on the earth in which to live. Scientific investigation had also determined that the common black or anopheles mosquito transmits malaria in the same way that the stegomyia transmits yellow fever. Hence, in Panama, as in Cuba, Colonel Gorgas drained the marshes and pools, cut the grass, screened the houses, and did the thousand and one other necessary things to destroy these two dangerous types of insect and to minimize their deadly influence. In addition, he maintained a most rigid quarantine. The same results followed his work on the Isthmus as followed his work in Cuba. No adequate praise can be bestowed upon Colonel Gorgas and his associates for the miracles of sanitation they wrought in Panama; and the lessons to be derived from their work will revolutionize all the tropical countries of the globe.

It has been said in the past that the Tropics were not made for the white man. The complete answer to, and refutation of, this statement is Panama. The excessive populations of the temperate regions in the years to come will flow to the Tropics, and will find there wholesome and enduring habitation; and they will there aid in converting the wilderness and jungle into smiling fields and gardens, banded by systems of road and rail, and studded with cities. In my judgment, the lessons in sanitation and disease prevention taught through the construction and maintenance of the Panama Canal will prove of far greater value to the world at large than will the operation of the canal itself. If you will pardon me for the personal reference, permit me to suggest that during my congressional service one of the most gratifying things I have been able to accomplish was the securing of the enactment of a measure providing for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in the city of Panama. This institution, bearing the name of General Gorgas, commemorates his great work as a sanitarian and puts into practical effect one of his hopes and dreams. It is now in operation, under competent directorship; it is supported by appropriations of our own and Latin American Governments, and is devoted to research and study touching the causes and prevention of tropical disease. Located at the most important point in the world for such study, and operated and maintained as it is, it bids fair in a few years to be the greatest institution of its kind in the world.

EMPLOYEES ON THE CANAL WORK

During the height of the construction period there were between 35,000 and 45,000 employees on the pay roll of the canal and on the Panama Railroad. The railroad was an indispensable agency in the construction of the canal. Of the totals thus employed, about 5,000 were gold employees; that is to say, white Americans, officials, and skilled laborers, and paid in gold and United States currency; and all of the others were unskilled, or semiskilled, workmen known as silver employees, and they were paid in silver money. At no other time and at no other place in the earth's history had skilled labor ever received so high a wage or so many benefits as during the canal-construction period in Panama. A chief reason for this was the fact that in the early days of the American régime the conditions on the Isthmus were so insanitary and uninviting that unusual inducements had to be offered to attract skilled labor; and wage rates and benefits having been once established they were not changed after Isthmus conditions improved.

COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION

The Isthmian Canal Commission served until April 1, 1914, when, agreeably to the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912, it was abolished on the ground that the canal had progressed so far to completion as to dispense with the necessity of the further services of the commission.

On August 3, 1914, the Panama Railroad steamship *Cristobal* achieved the distinction of being the first ship to pass through the canal

from ocean to ocean, this being a test trip to try out the canal. A few days later, on August 15, the Panama Railroad steamship *Ancon* made the first formal passage through the canal, making the voyage from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific and return. Since then the canal has been opened to general traffic, except at such times as it has had to be temporarily closed on account of earth slides in the Culebra Cut section. In the cut the channel has a minimum bottom width of 300 feet and a depth of 45 feet. The cut is about 9 miles long. Through the lake, a distance of about 24 miles, the channel is a thousand feet wide, with a minimum depth of 45 feet. Through the lake vessels may go at ocean speed. The distance through the canal from deep water to deep water in the two oceans is a little less than 50 miles.

TOLLS

Under enactments by Congress reasonable tolls for the transiting of ships through the canal have been fixed and are collected. These tolls are collected from merchant ships and the war ships of other nations. War vessels of the United States are exempted from the payment of tolls. The receipts from the canal substantially exceed the operating expenses, and in addition are yielding what may be considered as a fair return on the capital cost of construction.

PROCESS OF NAVIGATING THE CANAL

Anyone familiar with the method of passing a steamboat through the locks of our rivers, will readily understand how ships are moved through the locks of the Panama Canal and climb or descend from the 85-foot level of Gatun Lake. It requires about seven hours for a ship to pass from sea to sea.

BENEFITS DERIVED FROM THE CANAL

The benefits of the canal to the United States, as well as to the world at large, speaking from a commercial standpoint, are beyond calculation. It saves 8,000 miles of distance between our east and west coasts. It has already brought about vastly increased trade relations with Latin America and the Orient, and, in addition, there has been an enormous exchange of tonnage between the east and west coasts of the United States passing through the canal. At this time we are using less than one-half of the capacity of the canal in the transiting of ships through it. In 1915 the total tonnage passing through the canal was 4,888,000. In 1929 the total tonnage was 30,663,000.

In the opinion of Col. Harry Burgess, present Governor of the Panama Canal, himself a native of the South, a Mississippian, the present capacity of the canal is about 65,000,000 tons annually.

The greatest items of this tonnage are made up of cargoes passing between the east and west coasts of the United States through the canal. Thus in 1929, the total tonnage passing through the canal from the Atlantic and Gulf ports of the United States to west coast ports of the United States was 3,374,887; and the total tonnage passing from the west coast ports of the United States through the canal to Atlantic and Gulf ports of the United States was 7,465,076. The greater portion of the west coast to east coast tonnage was made up of crude oil shipped from the southern California fields to our eastern seaboard.

Next comes Australasia, to which region for 1929 there were passed through the canal from the United States Atlantic and Gulf ports 614,766 tons; and from which region there came to the United States Atlantic and Gulf ports, through the canal, 195,209 tons. In the same year there passed through the canal, from the United States Atlantic and Gulf ports to Asiatic ports, the total of 2,014,160 tons; and from Asiatic ports there came through the canal, to United States Atlantic and Gulf ports, 727,334 tons. Also, in 1929, there passed through the canal, from the United States Atlantic and Gulf ports, to ports on the west coast of South America a total of 427,489 tons; and from those points there came to the United States Atlantic and Gulf ports, through the canal, a total of 3,260,141 tons. In the same year there passed through the canal, from our Atlantic and Gulf ports to Hawaii and the west coast ports of Central America and Canada, a total of 178,110 tons; and from those ports there passed through the canal to our Atlantic and Gulf ports a total of 433,058 tons.

Our trade with the Latin American countries on the west coast of Central and South America is bound to increase in an enormous way in the years to come. In fact, all of Latin America from the northern border of Mexico to the southernmost tip of South America is a splendidly inviting commercial field. Throughout its great domain lie vast and practically untouched areas, highly mineralized; great and, perhaps, unparalleled forests of the finest timbers; and unexcelled stock-raising and agricultural sections. Not only this, but in this stretch of earth there is to be found every known climate; and practically all climates are found in the same section, because of the lofty mountain elevations in the Torrid Zone.

To the southward, therefore, there lies a world to be conquered commercially, and, in a great measure, socially. The marvelous work of sanitation achieved on the Isthmus of Panama having demonstrated, beyond peradventure, that the tropical lands can be converted into wholesome regions wherein the Caucasian can live and thrive, the question of what will become of the overflow populations of the Temperate Zones is solved for a period running far into the future. How infinitely better it would have been if the overcrowded and land-hungry

peoples of Europe had sought outlet and freedom in the central regions of Africa and Latin America, than to have waged against each other a desperate and horrible warfare, unprecedented in the world's history.

For a number of reasons all of these Latin-American countries constitute legitimate markets of the United States and ultimate "safety zones" for our excess population.

Republican forms of government prevail throughout Latin America except as to British Honduras and the Guianas; and, while some of them are based upon conditions of unrest and insecurity, the people of these countries are thoroughly imbued with the idea of democracy and will never tolerate any thought of monarchy; and, for the most part, the governments of Latin America are stable. Moreover, the tendency is toward a greater measure of stability; and when the youthful and vigorous of our own country shall emigrate in numbers to the tropical countries of Latin America, carrying with them American ideas of government and sanitation, there will result there an increased measure of stability. If man can live and achieve in the frigid regions of Alaska and Siberia, how much better can he live and achieve in the sun lands of the Tropics, with the skill of modern sanitary science to obviate the terrors of malaria, yellow fever, and plague. The fact that Americans and others from the Temperate Zones have wrought so great a work in Panama, through a course of years, and have retained so fair a condition of health, is itself a lesson of incalculable value.

Those who have never lived or traveled in Latin America can have no adequate conception of the boundlessness of its domain, nor of the variety and extent of its resources. Let us look southward a moment. In tropical America the banana and the orange, the grapefruit and the lemon—in fact, all the citrus fruits—coffee, hemp, cotton, cocoa, sugar, rice, and all other fruits, vegetables, and soil products known to the Tropics, can be grown in abundance and at reasonable cost. The achievement of the United Fruit Co. in placing the banana on the food map of North America is the proof of what may be done in those lands in the line of tropical fruit raising. The Panama Canal will enable us to exchange to mutual advantage for these products and for the minerals and timber of Latin America our farm products, our agricultural implements, our steel rails and railroad equipment, our boots and shoes, our clothing and other manufactured articles.

And so it is that with all these golden potentialities lying before us in Latin America the Panama Canal constitutes the ring and lamp, which, if we are wise, shall enable us to play the rôle of Aladdin, not only to our own benefit, but to the undoubted benefit of these, our neighbor countries, also. Every moral, political, and commercial consideration should bind us closer to our sister Republics to the southward. Pan Americanism is a great policy, and the canal adds infinitely to its potency. Our Government fully recognizes the great value of closer contacts with Central and South America, and Congress is now appropriating millions of dollars annually for adequate air mail service to these countries to the southward. We now have a 7-day air mail service between New York, via the Canal Zone, down the west coast of South America, to Santiago, Chile, and across the Andes Mountains to Buenos Aires and Montevideo, on the Atlantic seaboard. This line will soon provide two trips a week each way. Also we have an air mail service from Miami, Fla., via Cuba, Porto Rico, and the outer West Indian Islands to Paramaribo, in Dutch Guiana, on the Atlantic coast; and Congress recently made the necessary appropriation to extend this service down via Rio de Janeiro to Sao Paulo in Brazil.

Another benefit, world-embracing in its character, that should flow from the canal is the fact that it will make for the world's peace. It will vastly increase commercial and social communication between the countries of the earth, and this will make for better understandings and international friendships. Thus will be exemplified the striking motto inscribed on the seal of the Canal Zone government, "The land divided, the world united."

The canal and its control practically doubles the efficiency of our fleet as against any hostile nation. This fact is of the highest importance, and of itself makes for our national peace and security.

WHAT THE PANAMA CANAL MEANS TO THE SOUTH

The Panama Canal means everything to our Southland, because the ports of the Southland are hundreds of miles closer to the canal than are those of the northern sections of our country. In these days of speed and competition this is a vital advantage. The southern ports on the Atlantic seaboard and those on the Gulf of Mexico are handling a tremendous amount of shipping tonnage; and this tonnage should rapidly grow. Increased contacts with South and Central American countries should be made, and our southern people should utilize the great advantage which is theirs by reason of their comparative nearness to the canal. The State of Alabama has been very wise and provident in constructing the splendid dock and harbor system at Mobile; and this is an investment that should prove highly beneficial to all the Alabama section. Alabama's great mineral, forest, and agricultural wealth places the State in a position of great advantage in the use of the canal.

The total tonnage from foreign ports and from the west coast of the United States to our Gulf ports now exceeds 1,000,000 tons annually, while our Gulf coast shipments to foreign ports and the west coast of the United States has reached something like 2,000,000 tons a year.

FUTURE INTEROCEANIC CANAL NEEDS

There has been considerable discussion of late concerning the construction of another interoceanic canal. Recently Congress made an appropriation authorizing a study and survey of further canal facilities at Panama and other points, including Nicaragua. A commission has been appointed under this authorization and is now making a survey of the long-suggested Nicaraguan route. The length of that route is about 183 miles, a portion of which lies in Lake Nicaragua. Because of the length of such a canal and the many physical difficulties involved, its cost would be very high—possibly a billion dollars—with inclusion of the necessary fortifications to protect it. I am one of those who do not believe that the time is yet ripe for the construction of that canal, at least from the standpoint of economic requirements; and I know of no military needs which would justify its present construction. Congress has recently authorized the building of a new dam on the upper Chagres River in Panama at a cost of \$12,000,000. This will permit the impounding of the waters of the upper Chagres in sufficient quantities to form there a reserve water supply which may be used for hydroelectric purposes, and then, after it spills into Lake Gatun, for lockage purposes of the Panama Canal. Because of this additional water supply, another system or series of locks may be constructed paralleling the present system of Panama Canal locks, and this added series will increase the capacity of the canal by something like 50 per cent of its present capacity.

In the opinion of those who have been associated with the operation of the Panama Canal, and who have made a thorough study of the questions involved, the canal, with its capacity thus increased, should be able to take care of interoceanic traffic needs for a period of 75 years, or more, to come. The estimated cost of such additional series of locks is not more than \$100,000,000. Speaking for myself, and if I may use the expression, I believe that one "live" canal is better than two "dead" ones. The Panama Canal is a financial success, as well as a naval and commercial success; but if another interoceanic waterway should be constructed in advance of the reasonable need therefore, the result would be that neither canal would be financially successful, and both would prove financial losses for many years to follow, because of their dual operation and maintenance. It is wise to make the indicated surveys include that of the Nicaraguan route. Thereby all necessary facts will be secured and estimates of costs arrived at, to the end that when the time approaches when another canal should actually be constructed, our Nation will be in position to know the probable cost of that construction and the engineering facts involved. If there should be premature construction of a new canal this would mean the American taxpayers would have to pay interest on the bonds necessary for the construction, and perhaps the bonds themselves, as the income to be derived would not be adequate. It would seem, therefore, to be wiser first to construct a new set of locks at Panama at the lesser cost; and then, later, when the actual or reasonable need for another canal arrives, to undertake its construction. It would seem to be the part of wisdom now to utilize the funds which would be required for the construction of a new canal for the further improvement of the rivers and harbors in the United States.

DREAM OF COLUMBUS HAS BEEN REALIZED

The dream of Columbus of more than 400 years ago as to a western passage to the Indies, at last, through the building of the Panama Canal, has come true.

The movement to-day of the great ships of the world from deep unto deep, through the Isthmian outposts of the Andes Mountains, nearly 100 feet above the level of the sea, makes that dream a splendid reality. By the marvelous genius of the American people the fabled passage has at last been found.

Another thought: The Isthmus of Panama, which for years was known throughout the earth as its deadliest spot, has become one of its most wholesome tracts; and this narrow stretch of land lying between the two great oceans within the equatorial shadow, and long viewed by the world with disfavor or fear, in the providence of the ages has come to be, perhaps, the most important point on the globe. This slight ligament, which through the centuries gone has physically bound together North and South America, in the centuries to come, by the fact of its severance, shall bind and hold together the two continents in the closest bonds of commercial, political, and social friendship, and shall quicken and increase our contacts with all the lands of earth. In all of which there is seen once again the glorious exemplification of the scriptural truth, "The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner."

Truly, "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform."

INCREASED PRICE OF GASOLINE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, to-day the Oil Trust is increasing the price of gasoline 1 cent per gallon in Pennsylvania and Delaware. During the year 1929 the people of Pennsylvania purchased 1,047,914,175 gallons of gasoline. If the same amount

is purchased this year they will be compelled to pay \$10,479,141.75 additional by reason of the increase of 1 cent per gallon. Last year Delaware users of gasoline purchased 31,198,248 gallons; the additional 1 cent per gallon increase will cost the people of that State \$311,982.48 this year.

If the Attorney General of the United States has not acquiesced in the Gasoline Trust that was organized in St. Louis last fall by the Federal Trade Commission, this increase would not have taken place. A courageous Attorney General would have destroyed this trust before now. No bolder violation of the antitrust laws of the Nation has ever been perpetrated than was perpetrated by the big oil companies at the St. Louis conference. The representatives of oil companies assembled there under the leadership of the Federal Trade Commission after giving the commission notice that they wanted to set the price of gasoline. At the meeting resolutions were passed, which became agreements, in violation of the laws of the United States. Although the Attorney General has positive evidence of the formation of this illegal conspiracy against the consumers of gasoline, he has failed and refused to take legal action.

PRICE INCREASE NOT JUSTIFIED

There is no justification for this price increase. The price of crude oil has been going down recently. There is no shortage of gasoline, but on the other hand there is a surplus. The price is not based upon supply and demand, but is based upon illegal agreements entered into by oil companies. The large oil companies are making enormous profits.

INCREASE WILL SOON BE EFFECTIVE ALL OVER THE UNITED STATES

The price of gasoline was increased 1 cent per gallon in New York City May 1, 1930. On April 30, 1930, in a speech before the House, I predicted this increase and predicted at that time that the increase would soon be effective all over the United States. To-day it is effective in Pennsylvania and Delaware. I now predict that it will be effective in New Jersey in less than 10 days.

The 1-cent increase all over the United States will mean that gasoline users of the Nation will have to pay \$134,001,801.62 more for their gasoline—there were 13,400,180,162 gallons of gasoline consumed in the Nation last year. The 1-cent increase is equal to a direct tax assessment against every automobile owner of from \$5 to \$10 a year. Gasoline will probably sell for 30 cents a gallon within 24 months. The trust is receiving the sanction of the Department of Justice, and we may as well expect other increases to follow.

FOREIGNERS WILL SOON OWN OIL SUPPLY OF NATION

Sir Henry Deterding, head of the Royal Dutch Shell Co., announced a few weeks ago there was an end to the oil war. It is generally known that the oil war ended when the Federal Trade Commission organized the Oil Trust last fall. Wall Street bankers are letting the Royal Dutch Shell interest, a foreign concern that is reputed to be one-half owned by the British Government, have all the money they want, and that company is rapidly taking charge of the oil industry in America.

RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

If the Rules Committee will favorably report my resolution to investigate the Department of Justice, and the House authorizes the investigation, I can assure the Members of the House that evidence will be introduced before the committee to show that the Department of Justice is encouraging monopolies and trusts and is assisting in the destruction of independent business.

PAYMENT OF EXPENSES OF FOREIGN DELEGATES TO THE ELEVENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE FEDERATION INTERALLIEE DES ANCIENS COMBATTANTS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there are several minor bills which I would like to take up and I do not believe there will be any objection to them. By direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I call up the bill (H. R. 12348) to provide for the partial payment of the expenses of foreign delegates to the Eleventh Annual Convention of the Federation Interalliee Des Anciens Combattants, to be held in the District of Columbia in September, 1930.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$25,000 is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, as a contribution by the United States for the expenses and entertain-

ment, while in the United States, of delegates from foreign nations participating in the Eleventh Annual Convention of the Federation Interalliee Des Anciens Combattants, to be held in the District of Columbia in September, 1930. Such sum shall be expended by the national treasurer of the American Legion under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe. The United States shall not be liable, directly or indirectly, for any expenses, obligation, or indebtedness incident to such convention.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF AERIAL LEGAL EXPERTS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 299) to provide an annual appropriation to meet the quota of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That a sum not to exceed \$250 is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to meet the share of the United States of the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts, beginning with the year 1930.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NINTH INTERNATIONAL DAIRY CONGRESS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 333) to authorize an appropriation of \$10,000 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Ninth International Dairy Congress, Copenhagen, Denmark, 1931.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of defraying the expenses of participation of the Government of the United States by means of delegates in the Ninth International Dairy Congress, to be held in Copenhagen, Denmark, in July, 1931, an appropriation in the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized for travel expenses, subsistence or per diem in lieu thereof (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), printing and binding, compensation of employees, rent, official cards, entertainment, and such other expenses as the President shall deem proper.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING ACT

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I call up the bill (H. R. 11580) to amend section 1709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1083), and section 304 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 24).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1083), and section 304 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 24), is hereby further amended by substituting for fourth, fifth, and sixth paragraphs new paragraphs fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh, reading as follows:

"Fourth. To sell at auction, after reasonable public notice, such part of the estate as shall be of a perishable nature, and such further part, if any, as shall be necessary for the payment of his debts incurred in such country.

"Fifth. To transmit the balance of the estate to the General Accounting Office to be holden in trust for the legal claimant; except that if at any time before such transmission the legal representative of the deceased shall appear and demand his effects which are in the hands of such consul or vice consul, and said consul or vice consul shall deliver

them up, being paid their fees, costs, and expenses, and shall cease their proceedings.

"Sixth. The Comptroller General of the United States, or such member of the General Accounting Office as he may duly empower to act as his representative for the purpose, shall act as conservator of such part of these estates as may be received by the General Accounting Office, or are in its possession, and, for their protection, he may order such effects to be sold as may consist of jewelry or other articles which have heretofore or may hereafter be so received, and pay the expenses of such sale out of the proceeds, provided application for these effects shall not have been made by the legal claimant within six years after their receipt. The Comptroller General is authorized, in the name of the deceased, to receive any balances due to such estates, to draw therefor on banks, safe deposits, trust or loan companies, or other like institutions, to indorse all checks, bills of exchange, promissory notes, and other evidences of indebtedness due to such estates, and take such other steps as necessary for their collection, and to do and perform all and any other acts necessary for the conservation of such estates. The net proceeds of such sales, together with such other moneys as may be collected by him, shall be deposited into the Treasury to a fund in trust for the legal claimant and reported to the Secretary of State.

"Seventh. If no claim to the effects the proceeds of which have been so deposited shall have been received from a legal claimant of the deceased within six years from the date of the receipt of the effects by the General Accounting Office, the funds so deposited, with any remaining unsold effects, less transmittal charges, shall be transmitted by that office to the proper officers of the State or Territory of the domicile of the deceased citizen, if known, or, if not, be covered into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts on account of proceeds of deceased citizens, and any such remaining unsold effects shall be disposed of by the General Accounting Office in such manner as in the judgment of the Comptroller General is deemed appropriate, or they may be destroyed if considered no longer possessed of any value: *Provided*, That when the estate shall be valued in excess of \$500, and no claim therefor has been presented to the General Accounting Office by a legal claimant within the period specified in this paragraph or the legal claimant is unknown, before disposition of the estate as provided herein, notice shall be given by publishing once a week for four consecutive weeks in a newspaper published in the county of the last known domicile of the deceased, the expense thereof to be deducted from the proceeds of such estate, and any lawful claim received as the result of such advertisement shall be adjusted and settled as provided for herein."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, after the word "consul," strike out the word "and."
Page 3, line 18, after the word "not," insert the words "such funds shall."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this legislation relates entirely to estates of American citizens dying abroad, which estates may come into the hands of our representatives.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is correct.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FISH, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 4577. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between Longview, Wash., and Rainier, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 185. An act to amend section 180, title 28, United States Code, as amended;

H. R. 3975. An act to amend the act of March 4, 1925, chapter 521, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11430. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of New York to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River at or near Catskill, Greene County, N. Y.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution providing for the closing of Center Market in the city of Washington.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5258. An act to repeal section 144, Title II, of the act of March 3, 1899, chapter 429 (sec. 2253 of the Compiled Laws of Alaska);

H. R. 5261. An act to authorize the destruction of duplicate accounts and other papers filed in the offices of clerks of the United States district courts; and

H. R. 9804. An act to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, by extending the time within which applications for benefits thereunder may be filed, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAGUARDIA) there were—ayes 38, nays 37.

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, June 2, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Monday, June 2, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(10.30 a. m.)

For the extension of the immigration border patrol.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10 a. m.)

To authorize appropriations for construction at military posts (H. R. 1665 and 2754).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

511. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a bill to amend the act of Congress approved May 29, 1928, entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of certain employees in the Customs Service"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

512. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a bill for the relief of Capt. Chester G. Mayo, Supply Corps, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

513. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, in the amount of \$6,560, to provide medals for the officers and men of the Byrd Antarctic expedition (H. Doc. No. 437); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

514. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 438); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

515. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provision for the transfer of certain amounts from appropriations for the fiscal year 1931, aggregating \$187,870, and the reappropriation thereof for the salaries and expenses of the Personnel Classification Board for the fiscal year 1931 (H. Doc. No. 439); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

516. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 440); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

517. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1930, amounting to \$46,472.75 (H. Doc. No. 441); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3068. A bill to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1707). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7254. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act making an appropriation for the survey of public lands lying within the limits of land grants, to provide for the forfeiture to the United States of unsurveyed land grants to railroads, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; with amendment (Rept. No. 1708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. KAHN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7496. A bill authorizing an appropriation for improvements at the Guilford Courthouse National Military Park; with amendment (Rept. No. 1709). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9590. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PURNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 232. A resolution providing for the consideration of House bills 12056, 10341, 9937, 9985, 6806, 9601, and 2903; without amendment (Rept. 1730). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEERS: Committee on Printing. S. Con. Res. 22. A concurrent resolution to print and bind additional copies of Senate Document No. 166, Seventieth Congress, entitled "Interstate Commerce Act, Annotated"; with amendment (Rept. 1731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9937. A bill to provide for summary prosecution of slight or casual violations of the national prohibition act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOCH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7119. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Florida at or in the vicinity of Lake Worth Inlet; with amendment (Rept. No. 1733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHINDBLOM: Committee on Ways and Means. H. J. Res. 353. A joint resolution providing for an investigation and report, by a committee to be appointed by the President, with reference to the representation at and participation in the Chicago World's Fair Centennial Celebration, known as the Century of Progress Exposition, on the part of the Government of the United States and its various departments and activities; without amendment (Rept. 1734). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 12288. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to permit taxation of lands of homestead and desert-land entrymen under the reclamation act," approved April 21, 1928; with amendment (Rept. No. 1735). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12233. A bill authorizing the Robertson & Janin Co., of Montreal, Canada, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rainy River at Baudette, Minn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1736). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12522. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Texarkana & Fort Smith Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across Little River in the State of Arkansas at or near Morris Ferry; with amendment (Rept. 1737). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLIGAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3873. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Carondelet, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1738). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4269. An act authorizing the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or the successors of said commission, to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate bridges within Kentucky and/or across boundary line streams of Kentucky; with amendment (Rept. No. 1739). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mrs. LANGLEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 600. A bill for the relief of Charles Hellyer; with amendment (Rept. No. 1711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHRISTGAU: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1179. A bill authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to pay to Hattie McKelvey \$1,786; without amendment (Rept. No. 1712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2644. A bill for the relief of Louis Bender; with amendment (Rept. No. 1713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3059. A bill for the relief of Beryl Elliott; with amendment (Rept. No. 1714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. LANGLEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3136. A bill for the relief of D. F. Phillips; without amendment (Rept. No. 1715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHRISTGAU: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3653. A bill for the relief of Frank Martin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3729. A bill for the relief of Arthur Richter; without amendment (Rept. No. 1717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. LANGLEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4102. A bill to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Howard Lewter; with amendment (Rept. No. 1718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5391. A bill for the relief of Irene Lungo; with amendment (Rept. No. 1719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7161. A bill for the relief of Nelson E. Frissell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7195. A bill for the relief of May L. Marshall, administratrix of the estate of Jerry A. Litchfield; with amendment (Rept. No. 1721). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SIMMS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8310. A bill for the relief of Eula K. Lee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1722). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KINZER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9607. A bill for the relief of Helen Patricia Sullivan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOXEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10428. A bill for the relief of Edith Barber; with amendment (Rept. No. 1724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11185. A bill for the relief of Alex Bremer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12076. A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to credit the account of postmaster A. E. White, at Payette, Idaho, with certain funds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12374. A bill for the relief of William R. Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 1727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12498. A bill for the relief of Port Arthur Canal & Dock Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Nebraska: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3643. A bill for the relief of Alfred W. Mayfield; with amendment (Rept. No. 1740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHRISTGAU: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7047. A bill for the relief of Elsie M. Sears; with amendment (Rept. No. 1741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 12693) to amend the service pay bill of June 10, 1922, relating to the validation of pay and allowance of certain officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES (by request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 12694) to authorize the Air Corps of the Army to

make tests of aircraft and aircraft equipment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 12695) to authorize the granting of leaves of absence to civilian officers and employees of the executive departments and independent establishments of the Government, including their field forces, and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 12696) authorizing an appropriation for the purchase of the Vollbehr collection of incunabula; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 12697) to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CABLE: Resolution (H. Res. 231) to amend the rules of the House of Representatives by adding a new paragraph; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 12698) granting a pension to Amelia Good; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAIRD: A bill (H. R. 12699) granting an increase of pension to Elise Scheufler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12700) granting a pension to Hannah M. Witzler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12701) granting a pension to Charles F. Himmelberger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12702) granting an increase of pension to Fannie C. Dwelle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTON: A bill (H. R. 12703) for the relief of Capt. Chester G. Mayo; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 12704) for the relief of Frances Southard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 12705) granting a pension to Mary A. Stuck; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 12706) for the relief of John William Bardsley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HESS: A bill (H. R. 12707) granting an increase of pension to Emily Harte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 12708) granting a pension to Edna Liming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12709) granting an increase of pension to Elmira M. Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12710) granting an increase of pension to Elvira Pauley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: A bill (H. R. 12711) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Mullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 12712) granting an increase of pension to Ray A. Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7406. By Mr. BAIRD: Petition of members of Aerie No. 430, favoring enactment of Senate bill 3257; to the Committee on Labor.

7407. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of certain citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the vivisection of dogs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7408. By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition signed by 15 residents of Dayton, Ohio, asking for repeal of Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7409. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of John Fitzgerald, president Federal Employees' Union, No. 4, New York City, favoring the passage of the Saturday half holiday for all Government employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7410. Also, petition of the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations (Inc.), New York City, opposing the passage of House bills 10669 and 11876, providing for educational requirements for prospective citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7411. Also, petition of the New York State Federation of Labor, Albany, N. Y., favoring the passage of the La Follette-Kendall bill, S. 2540 and H. R. 6603, and the resolution for a

rule pending in the Rules Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

7412. By Mr. RAMSEYER: Resolution of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Keswick, Iowa, requesting Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7413. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of Mr. Richard Logan and 40 residents of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation increasing pensions for Civil War veterans and their survivors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7414. Also, petition of Ulysses Veney and 60 residents of Beaver Falls, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation increasing pensions for Civil War veterans and their survivors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7415. Also, petition of Theodore D. Crouse and 11 citizens of Butler, Pa., urging the enactment of Senate bill 476 and House bill 10466, providing increased pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

7416. Also, petition of Mr. N. A. Yoho and 60 citizens of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the enactment of Senate bill 476 and House bill 10466, for the relief of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

MONDAY, June 2, 1930

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 29, 1930)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

SPANISH WAR PENSIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on May 29 the question is, Shall the bill S. 476 pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Ashurst | Gillett | McKellar | Simmons |
| Baird | Glass | McMaster | Smoot |
| Barkley | Goff | McNary | Steck |
| Bingham | Goldsborough | Metcalf | Steiwer |
| Blaine | Gould | Moses | Stephens |
| Blease | Greene | Norbeck | Sullivan |
| Borah | Hale | Norris | Swanson |
| Bratton | Harris | Nye | Thomas, Idaho |
| Broussard | Harrison | Oddie | Thomas, Okla. |
| Capper | Hastings | Overman | Townsend |
| Caraway | Hawes | Patterson | Trammell |
| Connally | Hayden | Phipps | Tydings |
| Copeland | Hebert | Pine | Vandenberg |
| Couzens | Heflin | Pittman | Wagner |
| Cutting | Howell | Ransdell | Walsh, Mass. |
| Dale | Johnson | Reed | Walsh, Mont. |
| Deneen | Jones | Robinson, Ind. | Waterman |
| Dill | Kean | Robison, Ky. | Watson |
| Fess | Kendrick | Sheppard | Wheeler |
| Frazier | LaFollette | Shipstead | |
| George | McCulloch | Shortridge | |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, without reading, certain telegrams, and so forth, in reference to the Spanish War veterans' bill and the President's veto message.

There being no objection, the telegrams, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 29, 1930.

Senator KENNETH McKELLAR,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

More than 200,000 Spanish War veterans are greatly surprised and disappointed by veto of S. 476. This measure, just and fair in its terms, was unanimously passed by House and Senate. We appeal to you to vote for and urge the passage of S. 476 over the veto.

E. S. MATTHIAS,

Chairman Legislative Committee United Spanish War Veterans.

JACKSBORO, TENN., May 29, 1930.

Hon. K. D. McKELLAR,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Hope you will assist in passing S. 476 over President's veto.

Very truly,

WINSTON BAIRD.